

OBSERVATIONS

IN

OPPOSITION TO THE PROJECT OF PROHIBITING,

OR

GREATLY AUGMENTING THE DUTIES ON

FOREIGN MANUFACTURED ARTICLES:

BEING

REMARKS ON A MEMOIR,

READ BEFORE THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE OF THE STATE OF NEW-YORK, MARCH 8, 1825, BY GEORGE TIBBITS, ESQ. OF RENSSELAER COUNTY, AND AN ESSAY, BY THE SAME AUTHOR, DATED AT TROY, APRIL, 1827;

IN A LETTER

ADDRESSED TO THE AUTHOR OF SAID PAMPHLETS;

BY STEPHEN ALLEN,

OF NEW-YORK.

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED BY J. & J. HARPER, 82 CLIFF-STREET.

1827.

ADVERTISEMENT.

WHEN the following sheets were commenced, it was the intention of the writer, to have confined his remarks within the compass of a letter, of two or three sheets only ; but it was soon found, so many points would be left untouched by this arrangement, that it was abandoned, and the present course adopted. The subject is highly important to the citizens of this much favoured country, and ought to arrest the attention and engage the mind of every friend to humanity and equal rights. The author will make no apology for the style of his writing, or the language he has adopted to convey his ideas ; as he has only aimed at being understood, and at the same time, to lend his feeble aid, in opposition to a cause, which, he sincerely believes, if successful, will be attended with serious evils to this now happy and prosperous country.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

TO GEORGE TIBBITS, Esq. }
OF RENSSELAER COUNTY. }

SIR,—Your Letter, together with the Memoir, prepared and read by you before the Board of Agriculture of this State, and the “Essay,” intended as a supplement to the Memoir, have been duly received and perused.

The labour you have bestowed upon these works, and the researches you have made, are very creditable to your industry, and deserve from those whose particular interest you have advocated, the highest eulogies of praise.

There is no difference between you and me, upon the abstract question of fostering our own Manufactures: but, the question is, How far shall the ceded privilege extend? Shall it, as you contend, extend to “absolute prohibition, or greatly enlarged duties,” or, shall it receive the reasonable support which every disinterested man in the community would award it?

You would exclude foreign Manufactures, or lay a duty on them that should amount to an exclusion, and thereby grant the monopoly of the article to the interested few, while, in my opinion, and in which I am strengthened by those of the manufacturers themselves who are now in successful operation, the present encouragement is sufficient for every useful purpose.

In order to enforce the necessity and propriety of your monopolizing plan, of compelling the free citizens of these United States to purchase no cloth but such as shall be made here, and at any price which the privileged few may demand for it, you have, with all that determination of purpose for which you are so eminent, endeavoured to impress upon your readers the correctness of the idea,—that the establishment of extensive factories in this country, will not only add to the glory of the nation, but to the happiness of the people.

The main portion of your reasoning is addressed to the farmers, in the hope of securing their interest in favour of the British system of exclusion and monopoly, by inducing them to believe, that a large addition will be made to the price of their produce, if that system is adopted by the United States. The reasoning is fallacious, however, and the conclusions unfounded; at least, they are so in my humble opinion. By granting this monopoly to the manufacturers of wool, as you suppose, many of those who are now cultivating the soil, will relinquish it, and become spinners and weavers of wool; and whole colonies, of those who are now following that business in England and elsewhere, will emigrate to this country, and engage in manufacturing for us. These opinions of yours are only an echo of the same sentiments expressed by H. Clay, Esq., upon another occasion; and, in my opinion, can never be realized, even should the very disinterested recommendations of the Harrisburg Convention be carried into effect; for it is preposterous to suppose, that the agriculturists of our country, who own the soil they till, and are the most independent and happy portion

of our population, will ever be induced to leave their farms, for the purpose of entering your manufacturing establishments, and becoming the mere machines of some wealthy Nabob, who may happen to own them. Nor is it at all likely, that foreign manufacturers, who are established with their families and connexions at the place of their birth, will be induced to leave home, and the attachment of kindred and friends, by any encouragement held out to them by the manufacturers of this country. It was not a particular or special encouragement which induced the foreign artists to leave their own country and repair to England; but the cruelty of the Spaniards, in one of the instances, which drove the Flemish exiles from their homes; and in another, the revocation of the edict of Nantz, which was the cause of banishment to the Protestant population of that part of Europe. How then is the additional consumption of bread, pork, and turnips to be effected? If any number of our population, who are now engaged in other pursuits, shall be induced to abandon the mechanic, agricultural, or mercantile and trading occupations in which they may be engaged, and turn manufacturers, the consumption of provisions cannot be changed by the change of employment. While employed at their present business they are both fed and clothed; and it is not to be expected that they will be more than fed and clothed by the labour of spinning and weaving: and if the like effects are to result in this country, from the establishment of extensive manufactories of cloth, that have resulted in Great Britain, the country from which you have drawn all your precedents, we may safely conclude, that the situation of the workmen engaged in spinning

and weaving, instead of being mended, will be much worse than that of the most common labourer under the present state of things.

The farmers, who, according to your calculation, are to be the principal gainers by the monopoly of the manufacturer, will find that the price of their produce will be lessened, instead of raised; while, at the same time, by the reduction of the customs, their taxes will be increased, and the poor-rates of the counties doubled, if not trebled. These have been the effects in England, and why should they not be so here?

You state, that capital and labour, applied to land, have become less productive than a like capital and labour applied to almost any other object. This, in my opinion, is incorrect: for if we take the agriculturists as a class, and compare them with the mechanics and manufacturers, the merchants, the ship-owners, or the traders, we shall find that, where one of the former has failed, there are ninety-nine of the latter. Where are our wealthy ship-owners and merchants of twenty years' standing? How many of our mechanics and manufacturers have done more than obtain a decent subsistence? Have our traders and shop-keepers made fortunes? I need only refer you to the columns of the State paper at Albany for an exhibit of the vicissitudes of business, of every sort, except that of agriculture. You will find no farmers there advertising for the benefit of the insolvent law: they are happily exempt from the necessity of a resort to that measure; and if they know their own interest, they will continue so, by discountenancing the projects of the interested advocates of the English system, who wish to entail upon them, and their posterity, all the

evils of a wide-spread debasement of the human intellect and powers.

There is one circumstance which has tended to reduce the income from land, so far as respects the percentage on its cost. It is the monopoly of the landholders. These gentlemen, and you are no doubt acquainted with several of them, have monopolized nearly the whole of the prime tracts of land; and if a farmer wishes to establish himself or family, he can only obtain the land by paying a price far above its intrinsic value, compared with the income to be derived from its produce. The owners of these large tracts of land and the "innumeral water-falls" you speak of, are the loudest in favour of "shutting out foreign manufactured articles." The reason is very obvious; they expect, that, by establishing manufacturing towns in the vicinity of these lands and water-falls, they will be enabled to obtain high rents for small farms, and thus raise up a leasehold tenantry, subject to the control of the present owners of the soil, and their heirs for ever thereafter. The next step will be, to bring us back to the principles of entailed estates, abrogated by our fathers, and we shall be referred to the example of the English, as in the present instance, who, you say, have raised themselves by their policy and laws to an elevation of wealth, strength, political and civil consideration, to which they never could have attained, without that policy. The results of this policy, (as you say the results experienced there will be the same here) will be, that, in consequence of the increased rent of your farms, and the direct taxes for the support of government, consequent on the reduction of the customs, the farmers will find that some-

thing must be done to increase the price of grain, besides establishing large manufactories: for it is more than probable, that the Canadian farmers, whose taxes and impositions will be much lighter than ours, will be enabled to afford their corn to us at a cheaper rate than our own farmers can, under the circumstances we have alluded to; and in that case, the English system must be further resorted to, and a corn law must be enacted, that will exclude all foreign grain, except when the price shall be at a sum to be specified. If these are to be the results, and we have every reason to fear they will, is it not of the utmost importance, that every friend to the free institutions of our country, should exert all the energies of his mind to ward off so great a calamity?

That "the population of our country is essentially agricultural, or, more properly, agricultural and commercial," is admitted; but, instead of this fact being a subject of regret, as you appear to view it, it is, in our opinion, not only a sure test of our prosperity and happiness, but an undeviating pledge of the security and continuance of our republican institutions: for, let the influence of the agriculturists be merged in, or transferred to the manufacturers, and farewell to every vestige of equal rights. We are not willing to admit, however, that we "have none, or but a very few of the manufacturing class." It appears by a statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, dated 31st of March, 1826, that the manufactured articles exported from the United States, in 1824, amounted to \$3,169,115, and of manufactured articles not particularly distinguished \$3,003,865; making a total of manufactures exported that year of \$6,172,980. This is but a small proportion

of the articles manufactured in the country, if we include those consumed by our own population, which must be immense. In 1810, an attempt was made to ascertain the amount of manufactures in the several districts of the United States; a summary account of which is given by Mr. Seybert, in his Statistical Annals. The value of goods manufactured by the loom is stated at \$41,549,177, and the total of ascertained articles of domestic manufacture at \$127,694,602; by adding the doubtful articles to the foregoing amount, it will make an aggregate of manufactures of \$198,613,471; and we have good reason to conclude, that the additions to our manufactures since 1810, would bring the amount up to the sum of \$300,000,000. Although I have no data by which to estimate the number of people employed in the mechanical and manufacturing arts, we may safely pronounce your assertion, that we "have none, or a very small proportion of this class," to be very void of the fact.

You wish it to be believed, that our exports of domestic productions have materially decreased since the year 1790; and tell us, that foreign countries subsist very well without any, or a small proportion of our agricultural productions; and refer us for proof of this fact to the exportation of flour, wheat, and corn, in 1790, compared with that of 1823. I have been unable to ascertain from what source you have derived your information of the quantity of flour and grain exported that year; particularly, as you admit, which appears to be the fact, that the exports of domestic articles were not kept separate from those of foreign until 1796. I will not doubt the correctness of your

figures, however, while I dissent from your conclusion, that there has been a decline in the exportation of nearly every article of produce excepting the articles of cotton and tobacco. "The export of domestic articles, upon which the landed interest mainly depend," was, in 1790, as you state it,—

	Barrels.
Of Flour - - - - -	724,623
Of Wheat 1,124,456 bushels, equal to - -	224,891
Of Indian Corn 2,102,137 do. - - - -	420,427
<hr/>	
Making a total of	1,369,941

There is one circumstance which you have omitted to state, and which has an important bearing upon the question at issue ; viz. that in 1790, and for some years after, little or no cotton was raised in the southern states, and the agricultural productions of that section of our country therefore, were principally confined to tobacco and corn. This, you in substance admit, by stating the exportation of cotton in 1796 only at \$1,500,000, while in 1823 it had increased to the enormous sum of \$20,445,520.* By attention to this fact, we shall be able to account for the large export of grain in 1790—a good proportion of which was the produce of the southern states, who have since turned their attention to the raising of cotton, as an article equally as well suited to their climate as grain, and without doubt, of greater advantage to the cultivators of the soil, as well as to the country generally. Instead of

* I find by a statement in Niles' Register, that the quantity of cotton exported in 1791 was 139,316 pounds weight, and in 1792 it only amounted to 138,228 pounds weight, while in 1824 there was exported 141,369,663 pounds weight.

the unfavourable opinion you appear to entertain of the southern states, therefore, which tends to engender hostility between them and us of the middle and northern, it appears to me, we are under obligations to them for changing their agricultural operations from flour and grain to cotton and tobacco, thereby leaving the whole foreign market, for those articles, open to us, without their interference. Have we not a right to conclude, therefore, that instead of a decrease in the exportation of agricultural productions from this state, there has been a considerable increase since our southern neighbours have turned their attention to the cultivation of cotton? That the quantity of grain now raised, far exceeds what it was in 1790, will not be denied, inasmuch as the millions of acres brought into cultivation since that period, and the facilities afforded for conveying the products to a market, exceed all calculation. But laying aside all these considerations, I am still unwilling to admit that the exportations of flour and grain have decreased; for I find by a reference to the account of exports, that the flour, corn-meal, wheat, and grain, amounted to

	Barrels.
In 1820* - - - - -	1,471,884
In 1822 - - - - -	1,337,940
In 1824 - - - - -	1,378,593

Making a total of 4,188,417

and averaging for those periods 1,396,139 barrels per annum, which exceed the exportation of 1790, by 26,198 barrels annually. This shows rather a different state of things than what you wish us to believe exists; and

* The year ending 30th September, 1821, 1823, and 1825.

the more we examine the subject, the better we shall be satisfied with it ; for I doubt, whether there is a nation in existence, who have progressed with such rapidity in valuable production, as we have. In 1791 the whole of our exports amounted only to the sum of \$19,012,044 ; in 1795 we exported of American growth and manufacture \$40,764,097 ; in 1817 they had swelled to \$68,313,500 ; and we find by the last report to Congress, that in 1824 the total exports amounted to \$99,535,388. I will only observe, that the man who is discontented with such a state of things, had better remove to some more favoured country, if he can find it.

You consider the people of this country as having advanced only one step beyond the rude tribes of Tartary ;—that “ we have a surplus of cattle, bread-stuffs, provisions, and raw materials, *with a few rude artisans* ; and here we stop, unless we take in the productions of the sea and commerce.” This will be viewed as a very unfavourable opinion of yours ; and I am sorry that you have promulgated it ; for there are but few, if any, of your countrymen who will thank you for it, or who will believe that the comparison will hold good. We are led to believe, (however you may think to the contrary,) that in point of civilization, we are far removed from the state, in which “ the rude tribes of our own country,” or of the Tartar inhabitants of Asia, are to be found ; and that we not only possess an abundance of provision, the production of the soil, but that we have advanced in, and do possess a knowledge of, the arts and sciences required in producing every necessary article of consumption. It is no proof that we are unable to make certain articles. because we choose

to purchase them of others. You may be perfectly able to build your own house, and still prefer employing another to do it for you; and the same parity of reasoning may be extended to nearly all the necessities of life. The people of this country find it more to their advantage, to buy many of the manufactured articles from foreigners, because foreigners are willing to work harder and live poorer, and therefore sell their articles cheaper, than our own people, who are not compelled to feed themselves and families upon oat-meal gruel, and labour from twelve to fifteen hours each day to obtain even this scanty subsistence. But we deny that we have only "a few rude artisans." In many of the arts we now excel foreigners; and if the friends of your British system will only be content, we shall in a few years excel them in nearly all the arts. Where is the foreigner that can exceed us in cabinet-work? Need I refer you to specimens—go on board of our large steam vessels and Liverpool packets, particularly those lately built. Do they exceed us in the manufacture of brass furniture, of castings in iron, in coach and harness making, in boots and shoes, and leather of all descriptions, in silver-ware and jewellery, and even in broad-cloths, and some of our cotton fabrics? We answer, No—and might go on to enumerate many other of the arts, in which our countrymen are nearly, if not completely, perfect.

You seem to think it a matter of much regret, that we import from foreigners, articles that might be manufactured here, to the amount of \$31,000,000. But, besides the reason already stated, that foreigners work for one-twentieth of what our own countrymen require to live on, and nearly one-and-a-half hours to their one.

it may be further urged, that foreigners take from us annually between sixty and seventy millions of our domestic produce, and it is therefore necessary that we should take from them the articles we want in return; unless you would recommend to us the Chinese system, of sending all out, and receiving nothing in return except specie.

“The landed interest,” as you are pleased to style the speculators in townships and water courses, want manufacturers as the consumers of bread-stuffs and provisions, and for the purpose of converting the wool, hemp, flax, &c. into manufactured articles. All this is very well, and may be effected at pleasure, if you will only convert some of your bank and other stocks into cash, erect manufacturing establishments on some of your water courses, and invite, by liberal pay, the artisans to carry them on for you. All kinds of pursuits are open to the free citizens of these states; they are not compelled to serve a seven years’ apprenticeship, or to receive a patent from government, as in the country you so often refer for examples; but may commence manufacturers or artists at pleasure; but mind you, at their own cost—not at the cost of their neighbours or fellow-citizens, as you propose. Your answer to all this is, “that the difficulties and losses to be encountered at the commencement of any newly set-up branch of manufacturing business, are much greater than meets the eye of a casual observer, and cannot be overcome by any thing short of direct protection.” We answer, that every business is liable to the same difficulties, at its first commencement, that the manufacture of cloth is; particularly, if the persons undertaking it are ignorant of its principles. or possess not

the talent and industry necessary to a favourable result. That all these difficulties will be overcome in due time, however, and that the quality of cloth manufactured in this country, as well as all other articles; will be sufficient for home consumption at least, there cannot be a doubt. We have succeeded in articles of as difficult construction as cloth, and with less encouragement, and there is no reason why, with the ample protection given by the tariff of 1824, we should not succeed in this, as we have in other branches of industry.

If we examine the progress of this branch of manufacture in England, and compare it with the advance made in this country, and with the date of its commencement in each country, we shall find, in my opinion, that we are far ahead of that nation, without the help (as you consider it,) of their monopolies, exclusions, and prohibitions on the raw material.

It would appear, that the manufacture of cloth was considerable, during the reign of Henry I. of England.* During the reign of Edward III., which commenced in 1327 and ended in 1377, the woollen manufacture appears to have been firmly established in England. It also appears, that there was exported in the year 1355, 4774 pieces of cloth, and 8061 pieces of worsted goods. By a published account of the number of broad cloths milled in the West Riding of the county of York, for each year, from 1726 to 1817, it appears, that for the year ending the 12th of March 1726, there were milled 26,671 pieces of broad cloth; while in 1817 the number of pieces milled, had increased to 351,122

* See Note A.

pieces broad, and 132,607 pieces of narrow, making a total of 483,729 pieces woollen cloth manufactured in that district of the country. It is therefore about five hundred years since the commencement of the cloth-manufacture in England; but, presuming that the art has been perfected long since, we assume the date when the first account of the number of cloths milled in the county of York was made, say 1726, and on that data, it has taken the English more than three hundred years, with all the encouragements given them by their government, (as you deem them,) to bring this art to perfection.

The manufacture of woollen goods in this country, except what was made by families for private use, was very inconsiderable previous to 1812. The several embargoes, during the administrations of Jefferson and Madison, by preventing the importation of foreign cloths, induced many enterprising individuals to commence the manufacture of cotton and woollen goods, and these factories, with others that were brought into existence on the spur of the occasion, were kept in full operation during the war with Great Britain. There is much difficulty in ascertaining the true state of our manufactories; because those who conduct them have uniformly been dissatisfied with the profits they were making; and have therefore formed themselves into combinations for the purpose of forcing the government to increase the duties on foreign goods. If they are prosperous, you hear nothing from them; but if, from the want of knowledge, or necessary attention to business, they are broke down, the public papers groan under the weight of their complaints. We are only able to glean from the public journals therefore, a few

outgivings of the favourable state of our woollen factories.

It was stated, that the manufacturing capital of Connecticut in 1816 was \$450,000, and that they manufacture annually more than 500,000 yards of broad cloth.

The quantity of flannels manufactured in 1823, within forty miles of Boston, was stated to exceed 15,000 pieces of 46 yards each, and that in 1824 there would be made 30,000 pieces.

In 1826 an estimate of the value of the cloth manufactured in the United States was made to amount to \$24,000,000.

Niles' Register for September 1826, states that Messrs. Sykes and Co. of Baltimore have now at Philadelphia, at the store of Gillingham, Tevis, and Co., for public sale, 300 pieces of broad cloth, cassimeres, and satinets, the quality of which, for the prices asked, is better than the imported. Some of the cloths are of superior texture and colour, and all made by American workmen.

In the Register for November 1826, it is stated, that there had been another large sale of domestic manufactures at Boston, consisting of cloths and cassimeres, blankets, and carpeting. The amount of such goods now made in the United States, it is added, exceeds the belief of even those who have most attended to the progress of our manufactures.

The capital employed in the several manufacturing establishments throughout the United States was stated in 1824 to amount to \$70,656,500.

From the foregoing extracts, and the specimens that have been so often exhibited, of superior cloths made in our manufactories, we have a right to conclude. that

the making of broad cloths in this country, is now, at nearly the perfection that it was in England in 1726. We have, accordingly, perfected that in fifteen years, which took the people of England more than three hundred, to effect. There ought, therefore, to be no complaints on the subject of our manufactures; they are progressing steadily and surely, and will succeed. The gentlemen who have engaged in the business, and hold stock in the Companies, will naturally be discontented; and if Congress were to pass the bill, so modestly proposed by the Harrisburgh Convention, they would still complain; and the next year or two ask for an act of non-importation. But the bulk of the people, from whom it is proposed to draw this additional tax, to enrich the manufacturer, will believe with us, it is to be hoped, that sufficient has been done to encourage this branch of industry, whatever may be said to the contrary, by those whose views and feelings are based upon no better consideration than self-interest.

We have said, that if Congress were to pass the bill, so modestly required of them by the Harrisburgh Convention, the manufacturers, in one or two years, would be as discontented as they now are, and require additional bounty in some shape or other; and we have been led to a belief of this fact, by observing the course they have uniformly pursued. In 1823, they had a meeting in Boston, and the following is the language there held. “Protection, say they, is all manufacturers ask, *and we believe a moderate increase of duties, adequate to that purpose, without prohibiting woollen goods. We conclude that duties amounting to a prohibition would be unnecessary and unsafe.* A sudden and unnatural increase of manufactories would

ensue ; a great bounty would be given to this branch of industry, eventually detrimental to the recipients of it, and the demands of the country could not be immediately supplied by them." By this memorial, only a moderate increase of duties is requested, and not a prohibition, which they deem unsafe. It is admitted also, that American cloths yield some profit, though but little.

In consequence of these representations, and other measures adopted by the manufacturers of wool, the duty was increased in 1824 from 25 to 33 and a third per cent. The result fully verified the prediction of the memorialists of November, 1823 ; for although the increase of duty did not amount to a prohibition, it had the effect to cause a sudden and unnatural increase of manufactories. The stock of those in operation brought more than forty per cent. above par, notwithstanding many new factories had been erected, and others were building up in Massachusetts and in other parts of New England. (See Niles' Register for December, 1825.)

The speculations in this stock, and the builders of these numerous factories, found, however, that the amount they had expected from a rise in the stock, or the profits of making cloth, did not equal their expectations ; and in less than a year from the date of their golden anticipations, we find them calling meetings, and representing the depressed state of the woollen-manufactories. In October, 1826, a memorial to Congress is agreed upon. They complain that, "by the revision of tariff in 1824, the duties on imported woollen goods was advanced *only eight per cent.*, while that on wool was increased fifteen per cent. More than one-

third of the wool (say they) manufactured here, is obtained from Europe. The quantity of it produced in the United States is not equal to the demand for it; and our manufactories must obtain it from foreign countries. To increase the duty, therefore, would be to impose additional burthens on them, who are unable to endure those already existing. The memorialists, it will be observed, had no notion that the growers of wool should participate in the advantages they were seeking for themselves; although we are assured, that the chief object of the friends of the English system, is to benefit the farming and landed interest. Your complaint, therefore, "that the wool is grown in foreign countries instead of this," is disregarded. "Wool, say you, could not be sold at hardly any price. Sheep became useless to the farmers, and the flocks of sheep were killed off by thousands." But, say the memorialists, you are unable to furnish us with more than half, or at most, two-thirds of the wool we use. The quantity of it produced in the United States, is not equal to the demand for it, and we must obtain it from foreign countries. We leave the matter to be settled between yourselves; for our own part, we believe, that American wool has always brought a fair price, and we are assured, that good lots are now worth 50 cents the pound. Another complaint of these memorialists is, that the duty on imported woollens was raised only eight per cent. in 1824, and they talk of this additional tax upon the people, as of little or no value to them, because, say they, we are still unable to sell our cloths as low as those imported. Now let us see how this matter stands in figures, and thus ascertain the amount paid by the consumer of the article, in

favour of the maker of it. You have stated that we import woollen goods to the amount of \$8,000,000 annually. This amount is two millions more than I am able to make it; but we will assume \$7,000,000 as the value of the importations annually. We state, therefore,

The invoice cost of woollen goods at . .	\$7,000,000
Add 10 per cent.	700,000

Amount on which duty is to be paid . . .	\$7,700,000
Duty as per old tariff 25 per cent. is . .	1,757,000
Duty as per tariff of 1824, 33½ per cent., is	2,342,666

Difference \$585,666

It appears, therefore, that an indirect tax, of more than half a million of dollars, has been levied upon the people, solely for the encouragement of this particular business; and that too, without affording the least satisfaction whatever to those for whose benefit it has been laid. Are we not right in our belief, that if Congress were to pass the bill prepared by the convention, the same results would follow that of 1824? Additional capital would be invested, and additional companies formed, and consequently, "*the new beginners*" would lack that knowledge, skill, and economy necessary to success, and fail to realize the profits anticipated; they would, therefore, require further protection, until it amounted to what you hint at, a complete and total prohibition; and when that is granted, we shall probably be directed, as it was in England, to bury our dead in none but woollen shrouds, under a penalty for the omission.

You say, that “the owners of the factories in England, and the workmen attached to them, depend for their daily bread, upon sales in this country.” That we are good customers to them, cannot be denied; but while we take from them a large amount of their manufactures, they in return take from us such of our produce as they are in want of. The domestic articles exported in 1815, 16, and 17, to Great Britain and Ireland, according to Seybert, averaged more than \$22,000,000 annually; and whatever may be said to the contrary, should we exclude or prohibit importations from them, it is not unreasonable to fear, that they will decline taking from us, much of the products of this country, which now finds a market in their dominions. The exports of woollen goods from Great Britain for the year 1817, is said to amount to 8,404,481 pounds sterling, equal to \$37,353,244; and should our government be so unwise as to prohibit the importation of woollen cloths, the English will still have a market to their own colonies, and other countries, for about 30,000,000 of dollars, of the staple of their country. It would seem, therefore, that the whole dependence of the manufacturers, and their workmen, for daily bread, is not upon sales in this country, as you have asserted it to be.

You notice the loss sustained by the manufacturers of negro cloth and cotton bagging in 1823, 4. Whatever might have been the state of the market for those articles at the period you allude to, it is pretty clear, from the large quantity annually made now, that they are neating a fair profit to the manufacturer; and I am informed by a gentleman who was formerly in the habit of importing largely of the English cotton bag-

ging, that the American has taken the lead, and completely excluded the English from the market.

The imposition of high duties, or even the exclusion of manufactures, in your opinion, will not lessen the revenue derived from importations; because, say you, "it may be taken as a general rule, that every nation imports commodities from abroad, to about the amount which it is convenient for it to pay for."

"We have, you remark, been continually importing to the full amount of our exports, and bills have all the while been above par; in fact, over and above our exports, we have imported a good deal in advance of our means, or on credit." It has been a very common impression, that because our imports are stated to be of greater amount in dollars, than our exports, that for this reason, the balance of trade is against us; but, the fact is never adverted to, that the articles exported are always stated at the market price here, and not at the price they will sell for at the place of destination. For instance, if 1,000,000 pounds of cotton be shipped to Liverpool, which cost 10 cents the pound here, it is put down as an export of \$100,000; when at Liverpool it will, perhaps, sell for 15 cents the pound, and will of course purchase a return cargo of \$150,000; and this cargo, thus purchased, is put down here by our custom house as an import of \$150,000, while the export is only stated at \$100,000; and it is in this way that we are said to have the balance of trade against us, while, in fact, there is brought into the country, by this one simple operation, \$50,000 more than what were taken out of it. Now, if this principle, which is certainly the correct one, were extended to the whole of our exports and imports, it is pretty plain, that in-

stead of the balance of trade being against us, it must be greatly in our favour. The fact must be self evident; otherwise, how is it, that we are continually advancing in wealth? for no person surely will deny, that there is at least, three times the capital and wealth in the United States now, that there was thirty years ago. If, however, for the last thirty years, the balance of trade has been against us, some millions of dollars annually, instead of an increase of capital and wealth, we should have been bankrupt, or as you say we are, "exactly in the condition of the beggarly Spaniards."

The notion is, too, that if bills of exchange are at a premium, that the balance of trade is against us. This, however, is just as fallacious a sign as the other. A bill of exchange is money payable at the place upon which it is drawn; and, inasmuch as there are no acts making it usury for a person having funds in England to sell them for as high a premium as the person who wants the money will give, these bills are always high, or low, as all other commodities are, in proportion to the quantity and demand. They rarely exceed the par value, however, more than the cost of transporting specie, including the premium and insurance. If our money is not worth as much in England as their money is, we must pay the difference, or send more of it.—Precisely the same as any other article we export; if one pound of cotton will not buy a pound of silk, we must send ten pounds of cotton if necessary. Neither must it be concluded, that all the bills bought on England are for the purpose of purchasing English manufactures or produce; for it is a fact, well known, that the English bankers are the medium of exchange for almost all

the other parts of the world. The immense imports from Russia, for instance, are principally paid for by bills on England, and the same is the case with many other parts of the world, where the produce or manufactures of this country are not required in sufficient quantity to pay for the articles we import from them.

The importations of England, you state, must in the long run equal, or thereabouts, her exportations. You have adduced no satisfactory evidence of the fact, however, in either of the cases. I am unable to perceive how it can be made to appear, that even we, import as much as we are enabled to pay for. Have we no surplus wealth? The circumstance of the increase of our factories is a proof that there is, in the United States, a large surplus capital. The owners of this capital are unable to employ it in commerce, because the capital already employed is sufficient to pay for as much foreign production as the country can consume; and it is therefore diverted from that to the new branch. It is a fact too, that this surplus capital has been earned by the pursuits of commerce; and while following these pursuits, the owners of it, pretty generally, were the decided advocates of free trade, and the opponents of all restrictions; but, now that they have invested these earnings in this new pursuit, they have changed their minds, and their cry is, non-importation, restriction, and exclusion. Neither is it the fact, that the imports of Great Britain equal her exports. The exports from 1700 to 1721 inclusive, exceeded the imports 2,000,000*l.* annually; and the exports from 1722 to 1738 inclusive, exceeded the imports annually, 4,000,000*l.* From 1739 to

1762 inclusive, they exceeded the imports about 4,700,000*l.* annually. From 1763 to 1782 inclusive, they exceeded the imports only about 2,500,000*l.* annually. From 1783 to 1801, they exceeded the imports about 4,000,000*l.* annually; and from 1802 to 1806, the exports exceeded the imports more than 5,500,000*l.* annually.—(See *Cyclopedia*, title *Commerce*.) I have thrown off the odd numbers, and, therefore, may not be precisely accurate; but sufficiently so, I presume, to establish the fact, that Great Britain has, for more than one hundred years back, exported more than she imported. It is equally true, I apprehend, that by the exclusion of foreign articles of commerce, the customs are lessened, and the income of the government reduced. This has been the effect in England; and hence it is, that every article of value and consumption is taxed to an amount far beyond any conception we can have of the subject. The stamp-tax, from one to forty shillings sterling for a sheet of paper, upon which to draw a note, receipt, or other evidence of debt. The window tax, for permission to admit the light of heaven into your dwelling. The tax on legacies, from four to ten per cent. on their amount. The land tax, amounting to about one-fourth of the income of land. The income tax, amount, in proportion to income from trade. The house tax, proportioned according to the rent received. A tax for using hair powder, keeping dogs, horses, or servants. The excise being a duty on all articles of consumption nearly; beer, wine, spirits, things sold at auction, bricks, tile, candles, coaches, coffee, glass, hops, leather, linen, malt, paper, plate, salt, soap, starch, confections, tobacco, snuff, vinegar, and wire. The duty of customs, upon all cloth and

manufactured articles for home consumption. These taxes, and others, such as tithes, poor rates, &c. are exclusive of the duty on imported articles ; most of which, in my humble opinion, would have been unnecessary, were the system of exclusion, prohibition, and monopoly, discontinued by that government.

You appear to be delighted with “the good queen Elizabeth, and her excellent minister, Cecil, in protecting the manufactures and trade of her people, and for raising the revenue from fourteen to fifty thousand pounds sterling.” Now, as it would seem that you have introduced the doings of this Queen, as an example worthy of imitation, it may not be inappropriate to hear what the historian of that reign has to say on the subject.

Hume tells us, that this Queen “granted her servants and courtiers patents for monopolies, and these patents they sold to others, who were thereby enabled to raise commodities to what price they pleased, and who put invincible restraints on all commerce, industry, and emulation in the arts. The number and importance of these monopolies were so great, that when the list was read in the House of Commons, a member cried out, is not bread in the number ? Bread ! said every one with astonishment. Yes, I assure you, replied he, if affairs go on at this rate, we shall have bread reduced to a monopoly before next parliament.” These monopolists were so exorbitant in their demands, that they raised the price of salt from sixteen pence the bushel, to fourteen or fifteen shillings. “In order to enforce these exactions, the monopolists were armed with high and arbitrary power, by which they were enabled to oppress the people at pleasure.” “And while all domestic in-

tercourse was thus restrained, lest any scope should remain for industry, almost every species of foreign commerce was confined to exclusive companies, who bought and sold at a price that they themselves thought proper to offer or exact." "Sensible how much the defence of her kingdom depended on its naval power, she was desirous to encourage commerce and navigation; but, as her monopolies tended to extinguish all domestic industry, which is much more valuable than foreign trade, the general train of her conduct was ill calculated to serve the purpose, much less to promote the riches of the people. The exclusive companies also, were an immediate check on foreign trade."

It was by the granting of these exclusive privileges, more than by the "protection of the manufactures and trade of her people," that Elizabeth raised her revenue from fourteen to fifty thousand pounds sterling. It is admitted, that after the revolution, many of these "monopolies were put down," but not all of them, for there still exists the monopoly of the trade to the Indians, and it is believed there are others, not now recollected. But, it is denied, that the exclusion of foreign manufactures, has been the cause of augmenting the duties on importations in England, or that this result will follow a like measure in this country. According to Seybert's Statistical Annals, the total nett amount received into the Treasury of the United States from 1791 to 1800 inclusive, for duties on imported articles, was \$72,070,793; or annually on the average of ten years \$7,207,079, and during the ten years from 1801 to 1810, the nett amount received was \$122,943,981, or annually, on the average of the ten years, \$12,294,398. Was this increase of revenue caused by the exclusion of manufactured arti-

cles? Far from it. The cause was the extension of our commerce, the enterprise of our merchants, and the ability of our mariners, who have extended the commerce of the country to every known part of the world, and who are enabled, by the nautical skill they possess, and the superiority of our shipping, to make nearly two voyages to one made by any other nation on the globe.

The revenue derived from customs, from the 4th of March 1789, to the 31st of December 1814, amounted in the aggregate to 201,357,438 dollars and 99 cents, and constituted 65 per centum of the amount received into the Treasury of the United States, from every branch of revenue. The revenues from the customs in Great Britain, after deducting the sums obtained as loans, did not exceed 25 per centum of the public income. Thus we see, that the comparative customs of Great Britain are far less than those in this country; which demonstrates the fact, that instead of an increased revenue from foreign commerce, by the exclusion of the manufactures and produce of other countries, it is diminished by the operation; and the enormous expenses of that government are raised, principally, by loans, and direct taxation on the consumption of the people.

Mr. Pitkin in his Statistical View, furnishes a statement of the actual receipts from customs, from the commencement of our government to 1816. In 1791 they were \$4,399,742; and from that date they gradually rose, and in some years, reached as high as 16,000,000 of dollars. For the first six months of 1816, the receipts are stated at 15,426,951 dollars. It is pretty clear to me, therefore, that you are mistaken, when you suppose, that the exclusion of foreign manufactures from England. was the cause of the augmentation of the customs

from importations. Their customs are augmented, by the exclusive trade to their colonies, both in the East and West Indies, in addition to that secured to them by treaty with foreign powers ; and large as their receipts are from this source, amounting as you say, to 11,000,000 pounds sterling, they are only about one-sixth part of the expenses of the government, which were stated in 1809 to exceed 65,000,000 ; while the revenue from imports, with us, nearly pays the whole of our disbursements, both civil and military. This fact requires no demonstration, that, with the receipts from the customs, the sale of public lands, and some miscellaneous receipts, we have supported our government, without direct taxation, and reduced a public debt, which amounted in 1816, to 123,016,375 dollars, to 73,943,244, the sum at which it stood when the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury was made to Congress.

The success of our cotton factories appears to be a theme upon which you, and the whole combination of those interested in the exclusion of woollen goods, are fond of dwelling. That they have succeeded, gives me as great pleasure as it can you ; for, as I have already remarked, the question between us, is not whether encouragement, or no encouragement, shall be granted to our factories, but to what extent. Shall it extend to the exclusion of foreign articles, as you would seem to be in favour of, or shall it be reasonable and salutary, as, in my best judgment, it is at the present time ? “Give to the manufacturers of other articles the protection which has been given to the coarse cotton cloth makers, say you, and we shall soon have the required number of artisans, and home markets for all our agricultural productions.” The duty on imported cotton goods is 25

per cent., while the duty on woollen goods is 33 and a third per cent. The whole difference is, that cotton goods from the Cape of Good Hope, or beyond it, if the cost be less than 30 cents, are to be charged with a duty on 30 cents, and if from other places, the cost per square yard be less than 25 cents, it is to be charged with a duty on 25 cents; while woollen goods are to pay on the invoice cost at the place of exportation, except some very cheap stuffs, which are to pay on the square yard.

It appears to me, that the difference cannot be very great in favour of the cotton goods, over the woollen; and I am inclined to think, that it is more owing to the improvement in machinery, the knowledge gained by the manufacturer, and the very low price of cotton, together with the advantages of having the whole of the material raised among us, which is not the case with the wool, that gives the domestic cotton goods a ready market, for home consumption, as well as for exportation. The manufacture of cotton goods in England has increased, in part, from the same cause that they have here. The power loom, the mule jenny, and other machinery, have so much facilitated the work in that country, that cotton yarn, which sold in 1785 at 38 shillings, now sells for 3 or 4 shillings.

You remark, "that our government, during the late war, were unable to procure the six thousand blankets which it owed to the Indians; and the army was every way distressed for the want of blankets and clothing." This is a fact that has not come to my knowledge; but, I will venture to say, if the circumstance actually occurred, it was not because the article was not in the country; for we never were destitute of blankets, or cloth of some kind, no more than we were destitute of money; and yet the government could with difficulty

obtain the necessary loans to carry on the war. The loans were not taken, because the people of the eastern states, who were in possession of a large portion of the moneyed capital of the union, were opposed to the administration; and they, therefore, not only refused to lend the government any of their cash, but advised others to desist from subscribing to the loans; and went so far as to insinuate, that another administration might, and probably would, refuse to pay the money, loaned for the support of so unrighteous a war. Now, it is by no means improbable, that men entertaining such views, would refuse to sell to government, blankets or any thing else, for the use of the army or Indians. Are not many of the men of wealth, who have vested large sums in the establishment of factories in the eastern states, and who are crying out for protection, high duties, and prohibition, the same who so strenuously opposed the late war?

I am led to think, however, there must be some mistake about these Indian blankets, and soldiers' clothes; for I find, that but a little while previous to the war, namely, on the 22d of February, 1812, the legislature of Massachusetts passed the following resolution:—

“Resolved, That his excellency the governor, communicate to the general government, the perfect ability and disposition of the government of this commonwealth, to make the most prompt provisions for the immediate supply of such blankets and clothing, as the general government may wish to contract with the citizens of this commonwealth, for sufficient to meet any contingency which may occur; and to request any information of any other articles which are or may be wanted for supplying the Indians, as there can be no

doubt of the ability of this commonwealth to supply, by contract, any such articles, mostly, if not altogether, from our own manufactures."

At the period in which this resolution was passed, the Legislature of Massachusetts was republican, and, consequently, friendly to the administration, as well as the war. Whether any contract was entered into, or goods supplied, I am unable to say ; but it is evident that the ability to supply them existed ; although, on the change of the political complexion of the state, the disposition may have changed also, and the general government been refused a supply of the articles required.

About the same time that the transaction alluded to occurred, an attempt was made in Philadelphia to ascertain on what terms a supply of clothing for the army could be obtained, and the success was said to be greater than what could have been expected in the present imperfect state of American manufactures. "In regard to all goods made of cotton, for purposes requiring strength, or neat uniform appearance, the present capacity of this country was manifested, on this occasion, to be far greater than our actual or probable wants require."

"In the woollen branch, offers were abundant ; and the finer the goods or materials proposed, the more ready the disposition, and abundant the quantity, in proportion to the demand, and moderate the price." (See Niles' Register.)

If the army were distressed for the want of blankets and clothing, during the late war, as you say they were, it was not because they could not be supplied in this country : for we see from the foregoing

extracts, that the ability to furnish them did exist ; and also, that, not only the manufacture of cotton goods was then in considerable perfection, but also that of woollen cloth.

You appear to omit no opportunity to eulogize the British government, even if it is done at our own expense. "The policy of England," say you "is directly the reverse of ours ; she discourages the importation of manufactured articles ; and by pursuing this policy, the nation has been raised to comparative eminence ; and so equalized the capital and labour of the country among all the arts and professions, that she meets any exigency without difficulty. She has thereby multiplied her number of people, and increased her effective means, until she may well defy competition. She closed a war of twenty years, and raised, by taxes and loans, 7,656 millions of dollars ; and apparently with less financial distress, than we experienced in our short war with her." You state, further, that England has remitted taxes of more than twenty-eight millions, and has established a sinking fund of 22,500,000 dollars, which is fast reducing her debt ; and farther on, you say, that England not only pays for, and imports, an immense quantity of foreign articles with its manufactures, but has accumulated the securities of foreign governments ; and she is notoriously a large holder in the stock of this country. And you ask, shall we profit by the example of England ? To arrive at the same point of elevation, and that comparatively soon, we have only to adopt the measures which England did, and to avoid her unnecessary wars.

Her policy, relative to manufactures, has been the

reverse of ours ; and, in my humble opinion, if we wish to perpetuate the happiness of the great mass of the people of this country, our policy ought to be, in many respects, the reverse of that adopted by England.

Let us see what the policy of England has been, from early time, respecting her woollen factories.

It appears that the kings of England not only encouraged and protected foreign manufacturers, and others, but also permitted the free exportation of wool, *because the whole revenue went into their exchequer.*

The cloth weavers paid an annual sum to the king for the privilege of carrying on their business ; and those who dealt in the buying and selling cloth, also paid an annual amercement for the king's use. In 1336 a duty was exacted on all cloths exported to foreign places. In 1357 divers statutes were passed which proved the narrow and selfish policy by which the manufacturers were influenced. They took advantage of their monopoly to defraud the purchaser. These statutes refer, either to restrictions which the manufacturers wished to impose, in order to confine the trade to themselves, or are enacted to prevent them from a fraudulent packing or weaving of their goods.

It may not be improper to inquire, whether our manufacturers, in the event of the monopoly being ceded to them, will act with greater honour and honesty than what the English did, until they were restrained by severe penalties, within the bounds of moderation ?

In 1460, an act is passed declaring that if Brabant,

Holland, and the dominions of the duke of Burgoin, do not receive the English woollens, the merchandise, either growing or wrought in those dominions, shall be prohibited in England.

Here is a specimen of "the policy of England," which, in the event of "the American system" being adopted, may again be put in operation. They may say, if you refuse to receive our woollens, we will not receive your cotton, tobacco, ashes, lumber, bread-stuffs, and provisions, &c.

In 1500 the manufacturers were prohibited from charging for their cloths, more than sixteen shillings per yard for superfine, and eleven shillings for common, under a penalty of forty shillings for every yard sold for more than those prices.

Will our manufacturers be willing that a similar act shall be passed here? or will they not cry out, it is a restriction on the freedom of trade, and contrary to the rights of the citizen? That such an act will be necessary, provided the law proposed by the self-created convention shall be enacted, there cannot be a doubt. The people of England soon found, that there is no conscience in a monopolist, and that unless they were restrained in their charges, their impositions would be oppressive.

In 1527, the market was overstocked with woollen goods; and no purchasers appeared. The consequence was, a want of employ for the manufacturers, and an insurrection among them. The minister called a meeting of the merchants, and undertook to reprimand them for not purchasing the goods; and threatened to open a new mart, where the king would become purchaser of cloths, and sell them again to foreigners.

This overstocking of the market, and throwing a great number of men out of employment, is one of the evils to be dreaded, from the establishment of large manufacturing establishments.

An act was passed about this time, prohibiting every person, except the woollen manufacturer and merchant of the staple, from buying any wool to sell it again.

By this act, the whole monopoly of this article was placed in the hands of these persons,—the one having the exclusive privilege of working up the wool, and the other the privilege to export it.

It is no wonder, that, with the enjoyment of these monopolies, the manufacturers became wealthy. We are told, that one man, in an expedition against the Scotch, sent 100 men fully equipped at his own expense ; and several others are mentioned as becoming rich in a short time from the great profits of the business.

In 1530, an act was passed, reciting, whereas no coverlets had been made elsewhere, until lately, that no person shall manufacture coverlets in Yorkshire, but the people of York. “ Thus we see, (says the historian) under the flimsy pretext of public benefit, the manufacturers were willing to disguise that selfish spirit of monopoly, which disgraces almost every page of our commercial history.”

An act was also passed, prohibiting any person from making cloth in the county of Worcestershire, except in the city of Worcester. Another act was passed, about 1558, prohibiting the making of woollen cloth, except in a market town, or in a city, borough, or town corporate, where cloth hath been used to be made for the space of ten years.

This is a sample of the English policy, until James the First. It appears, that the art of dying the cloth was not understood in England until some time after this period; and all the cloths exported, were white and undressed. In 1608, however, the exportation of white cloths was prohibited, and an exclusive patent was given to a company of merchants for dying cloth, the king to have the monopoly of those sold for exportation; he at the same time seized the charter of the company of merchant adventurers, which authorized them to export white cloth. These dyed cloths were neither as well done, or as cheap, as those finished in Holland; and they would not sell, therefore, except for home consumption. The manufacturers were out of employ, and, accordingly, protested against the patent to the dyers, and the king was finally compelled to annul the patent, and permit the exportation of white cloth as usual. Thus, says Anderson, in his *Commercial History*, "merely by proceeding too precipitately, an art, which afterwards was brought to absolute perfection in England, was now deemed impracticable for our people to perform."

The experiment here made, to force the manufacture of dyed cloth, before the nation was prepared for its reception, ought to be a warning to us, not to drive this matter too hard; for our manufacturers may rely upon it, should they obtain a law that will virtually prohibit foreign cloths, and if the result cause a considerable rise in the price of the article for consumption, or lessen the revenue, and lead to direct taxation, that the consequence will be, a reaction against the law, and congress may be compelled to repeal it; in which event, it will be found, that manufactures, in-

stead of advancing as they now are, will decline, and it will require years to bring them back to where they now stand. In 1622, the exportation of wool was prohibited. In 1640, wool was permitted to be exported on the payment of a duty. In 1647, the exportation was again prohibited. In 1678, an act was passed for regulating the public markets for cloth in England. The act prohibited the sale of all cloth sent to London, except at the designated markets, where a duty was to be paid to the government. No foreigner or alien was permitted to purchase cloth in England, under severe penalties.

“Thus, in those days, the turning purchasers out of the public markets, and the securing the sale to a certain class of buyers, was considered an act for the benefit of the public.”

The Irish had also commenced the manufacture of woollens, and although it was supposed that the Irish manufactures were inadequate to the supply of one-fourth part of the population of that country, they nevertheless excited great jealousy in the English manufacturer, who ascribed their distress to the Irish clothiers; and “addresses were presented to the king, beseeching his majesty to take effectual measures to prevent the growth of the woollen manufacture in Ireland.” The consequence was, that “an act was passed in the year 1699, prohibiting the exportation of woollen manufactures from Ireland, except to a few ports in England and Wales, where the duties imposed amounted to a total prohibition.”

The exportation of wool is now prohibited both from England and Ireland; except, that the Irish may send their wool to England; and by an act of the 20th

George III., the prohibition to the Irish to export cloth was repealed.

We have now given a short expose of the English policy, as it respects the manufacture of cloth ; and we are led to conclude, that every disinterested man will agree with us, that the policy is one that we ought to avoid. The system has been one of exactions, monopoly, and imposition. The manufacturer was made to pay an annual fee for the privilege of carrying on his business. He, in his turn, made use of his monopoly to impose upon the public by the charge of one or two hundred per cent. profit, until another statute is made to restrain him in his demands. The grower of wool also, was compelled to pay an export duty on the produce of his land, and now he is prohibited from selling it, except to the English consumer. Foreigners were encouraged to emigrate to England, not so much because they were an acquisition to the art of making cloth, as that they brought revenue to the king. And even now the many acts in force, to prevent fraud in the packing of wool, to prevent the exportation of it, the deceitful working of the cloth, fulling it, the length, breadth, and weight, the dying, dressing, and mixtures of it ; concerning the burying of the dead in it, &c. &c., all tend to show, that that policy is neither equitable or just which requires such a multitude of legislation to enforce it, among a people too, who in your opinion, are receiving such immense benefits from its operation.

By this policy, as you aver, the English nation has been raised to comparative eminence in wealth, strength, and political and civil consideration ; and has equalized the capital and labour of the country among

all professions, &c. As to her eminence in wealth and strength, she has waded through seas of blood for its possession, and with all her strength, and her thousand ships of war, she was unable to retain this country in colonial bondage, or to subdue us in our two and a half years of war, destitute as we were, in *blankets and clothing*. And what evidence, pray, is there, that the capital or labour of the country has been equalized? The population of England is stated at about 12,000,000, and not less than one-sixth, or 2,000,000, are paupers, exclusive of the army and navy, and those confined in their hulks and prisons. There is, in fact, too much of riches, and too much of poverty in England; and the nature of their institutions are such, that there never can be an equalization of labour, capital, or property.

That she has multiplied the number of her people by the extension of her manufactures, will not be denied. They are, however, a population of wretchedness, doomed to labour incessantly, to live sparingly, and to die miserably. They are, in the words of an eye-witness, “deprived in childhood of all instruction, and all enjoyment, of the sports in which childhood instinctively indulges; of fresh air by day, and of natural sleep by night. Their health, physical and moral, is alike destroyed; they die of diseases induced by unremitting task work, by confinement in the impure atmosphere of crowded rooms, by the particles of metallic or vegetable dust which they are continually inhaling, or they live to grow up without decency, without comfort, and without hope; without morals, without religion, and without shame, and bring forth slaves like themselves, to tread in the same path of misery.”

This, perhaps, is as true a picture as can be drawn, of the population brought into being by the encouragements and inducements to early marriages, held out by the manufacturers of England, in order to supply these establishments with the necessary number of hands, at a cheap rate ; and it is by these means, that they are enabled to undersell all other nations, and continue the monopoly of many of the finer fabrics in their own hands. Will not the same system, if pursued in this country, produce the same effects ? And if it will, ought not every friend to humanity, oppose its adoption ?

The millions she (England) raised by taxes and loans, and the twenty years war she waged, although it may tend to show the arbitrary and tyrannical powers of the government, has added nothing to the real strength or wealth of the nation ; that many have amassed wealth, will not be denied ; but it has sunk the labouring part of the population to a greater depth of misery than what they experienced before the event. In 1820, several years after the termination of the war you allude to, it was stated by a member of parliament, that a labouring man, with the miserable gains of the best weaver, namely, seven shillings a week, or eighteen pounds five shillings a year, equal to eighty dollars the year, pays ten pounds, or forty-four dollars forty cents, for taxes ; leaving eight pounds five shillings, or thirty-six dollars sixty cents, for the maintenance and education of his family. Of what consequence then, was the eminence and wealth of the nation to this man, and to millions of those like him, who are compelled to labour incessantly, in order that they may barely subsist upon food of the coarsest quality, and the least possible quantity ?

The taxes remitted, and the sinking fund established, which is fast sinking her national debt, as you assert, have neither lessened the burthens of the people, or enabled the government to avoid fresh loans, to meet the current expenses of the year. It would appear, that with the remission of the war taxes in England, the ability of the people to pay had diminished; otherwise, why is it that the importation of flour and grain is prohibited? The fact is, that "the taxes are so heavy, that the farmers cannot live without a home monopoly of the supply of bread stuffs, and meat;" and the consequence is, that the labouring man, if he were permitted to buy his food in the cheapest market, might purchase his bread for about half of what he has to pay under the present system; the prohibition, therefore, has the same effect as if he were to pay a direct tax of more than half his earnings to government.

As to the famous sinking fund, it is a mere deception; for scarce a year has passed, since its creation, that loans have not been made to supply its deficiencies; and the only benefit that has accrued under its operation, has been, to enable ministers to contract loans with greater ease and facility. This famous sinking fund, was first put in operation in 1773. In the year 1792, the English debt was 238,231,218 pounds sterling, and in 1824, it amounted to the enormous sum of 796,530,144 pounds sterling; and, as an evidence that the sinking fund is not reducing the debt, even in a time of profound peace, we have only to refer to the speech of the late Mr. Canning, when opening the Budget, as it is called, for the present year. If the revenue were sufficient to pay the current ex-

penses, and at the same time to appropriate the sum set apart for the sinking fund, how comes it, that the minister required the necessary authority from parliament, to create a large amount in exchequer bills ?

It is true, as you state, that many of her wealthy men have invested their money in the stocks and securities of other nations, and perhaps to a considerable amount in our stocks. But, to suppose that all this individual wealth arises from the exportation of the articles manufactured in England, is, in my opinion, chimerical. Much of the individual wealth of England, arises from moneyed transactions and speculations in foreign loans. If a loan is required by a foreign government, application is, in no instance, made to ministers, but to individual bankers ; and the contract is generally in favour of the individuals who loan, and against the government taking the loan. It seldom requires more capital than one-tenth part of the amount to be loaned, provided the sum borrowed, which is usually the case, is to be paid by instalments. The first instalment being paid, stock is created and disposed of, in order to meet the next, and so on ; and by this means, and the thousand ramifications connected with these moneyed transactions, the original contractors, by the time the last instalment of the loan is paid, are only in possession of the net profit of the transaction. There is, besides these moneyed speculations, considerable profits made by supplying the colonies, and foreign countries, with whom commercial treaties exist, with the articles imported into England, from the four quarters of the globe.

The reason why these foreign stocks are held and accumulated in England, and particularly the stocks

of this country, is, that many of the moneyed men there, have more confidence in the stability of our government, than they have in their own; and another reason may be, the exemption from taxation of such property; and an additional one, that there is no opportunity of investing money in real estate in England; for on the one hand, so large a portion is under entail, that very little can be purchased on any terms; and, on the other, the taxes on land are so heavy, that scarce any clear income can be derived from it.

I will only add here, that the wars of England, have, almost all of them, been prosecuted for the purpose of increasing her commerce, by adding colonies to her dominions, or for securing to themselves the commerce of particular regions of the globe.

“By giving the younger and growing population, business at home, we shall prevent them from strolling into Canada, or Michigan, in search of new places of residence.” And thus you would turn them from the healthful and independent employment of agriculturists, to the enervating and dependent employment of manufacturers;—mere operative machines, for the benefit of the overgrown capitalists, who have established these extensive work-shops!

The canals, too, in your opinion, are to be the means of helping people out of the state; and thus become a means of lessening, instead of increasing, our population. This is a result that has not been anticipated, and certainly has not been realized; for, instead of helping people out of the state, they have annually added to our population by the emigrations from Canada, both Upper and Lower.

“Seven-tenths of the hands employed in our cotton

mills, would have earned but little or nothing, but at some such employment." True, neither ought they to earn any thing at their tender age ; but, instead of being kept at school, in order that their mental faculties might be improved, they are sent to the cotton mill, where they are kept at incessant labour for the benefit of their indolent parents, or the owners of the works, until they are married off; and then they know nothing of the domestic concerns of a family, and merely raise up a miserable race of beings, to fill the place at the mill, which they have vacated.

"At the commencement of manufactures in most countries, there is a seeming want of hands; but if manufactures had not been established, the hands employed in them might not have been in existence." True again. In establishing a new factory in England, the custom is, to employ women to go round the country and induce the peasantry to apprentice their children, or to hire them, for a trifling pittance, to the factor. As these children grow up, they are encouraged to marry early, in order that the offspring may supply the factory with hands; and thus it is, that the hands employed in these establishments might not have been in existence, had it not been, that they were necessary to the interest of the capitalists who founded the works.

"The statesmen of England," say you, "never for a moment thought of following the plausible theories of the Adam Smiths and M. Says of the day." And when, pray, have the statesmen of England followed any other theory, or practice, but such as was calculated to increase their power, or to keep the reins of government in their hands? The truth is,

that the liberty of the subject, in England, such as it is, has been wrung from the grasp of arbitrary power by the strong arm of the people, and not by the concessions of the sovereign, or his ministers and statesmen. Had the voice of the patriot Hambden been heard and attended to, the monarch would have saved his life, and the people a civil war and oceans of blood. Had the voice of Chatham and Burke been heard, the colonies, now the United States, might possibly have been saved to England. The people of England are as capable of sustaining a free government as we are ; and of this they are sensible ; and would effect their own liberation from the arbitrary power of the aristocracy, were they not awed by the bayonets of the soldiery. How is it with Ireland ? Oppression and ignorance are their lot. No statesman raises his voice in their favour with effect. Those who are out of place, it is true, are great friends to the reform of parliament, and removing the religious inability of the Irish gentlemen ; but not a word about restoring to the poor their natural rights ; and even the reform of parliament, and the case of the Catholics of Ireland, are forgotten, so soon as the oppositionists are placed into office. The statesmen of England, at least such of them as have usually governed that nation, have never shown a disposition to restore to the labouring population their just and equitable rights ; it is the interest of the nobles and gentry that has always been consulted—not that of the labouring peasantry, manufacturer, agriculturist, or mechanic. To answer the purposes of that government, the poor must be kept miserably poor, in order that a proper distinction of classes may be maintained ; their wages

must be regulated by law ; and whatever favourable circumstances may occur, there is no gain to them by the change—it all goes to their employer ; they are prohibited from removing from one country in the kingdom to another, nor can they remove out of it ; and they are, in fact, as much and as firmly bound to the place of legal settlement, as the vassals of Poland or Russia are bound to the soil upon which they were born. That the circumstances and condition of the higher classes in England are improved, may be true ; but the poor are no better off than they were a century ago ; the reason is obvious—there is no opportunity for them to rise, because it is not the interest of their rulers that they should rise. It is from them that the army and the navy are recruited and manned ; and it is from the incessant labour of their hands, that the higher orders are enabled to roll in luxury and extravagance. This degradation of character and circumstance of the poor in England is owing, in some measure, to their political incapacity : they have no voice in the choice of those who govern them, and who make arbitrary laws to bind them and their posterity ; and they submit therefore to their fate, under the conviction, that to better it is hopeless. Much of this degradation, however, is brought upon them by the extensive manufacturing system. The time was, when the manufacturers of cloth in England resided in the country, and when they were employed a part of their time in agricultural pursuits, which, perhaps, was the happiest form under which manufacturing could be conducted ; but, since the introduction of machinery, the population has been drawn (says Dr. Rees) into the large factories ;—“a change, which

may be regarded as one of the greatest evils that can affect civilized society ; tending directly to degrade and enfeeble the human race, and to render man a wretched machine, a prisoner from the cradle to the work-house or the grave, devoid of moral feeling or physical energy."

Had the statesmen of England exerted their energies and powers to unshackel the people from the absurd and cruel restrictions upon their industry, and thereby permitted the capital, enterprise, and labour of the nation to have free scope, the people of England would have been a happier, if not a wealthier nation, than they now are. Much is said, and boastingly too, of the excellence of the British government, in the security of the person and property of the subject ; but, is not the labour of the man, as valuable property to him, as the money or land of another is to him who owns it ? Every man ought to be permitted to dispose of his labour and ingenuity to the best advantage, for his own benefit ; without this, there is no freedom of action ; and the freedom of the subject is but an empty name. In England, the reasonings of Smith, Say, and a number of other worthies, are not followed, because they were based upon the principles of right and justice, and would tend to exalt the character of the subject, instead of enslaving him, by statutes, such as the following : " Declaring that no clothiers, woollen cloth weavers, &c. shall be retained at work for a less term than one whole year ; and that any person having been brought up at any of the said trades, on the request of any person using the same, shall be retained and serve such person, on pain of imprisonment. If, however, he has an inheritance

of forty shillings a year, or is worth ten pounds in goods, he is not to be liable to the provisions of the act." The same compulsory provisions are extended to the labouring agriculturists, and mechanics; they are compelled to serve by the year, with any person requiring them, in the employment to which they were brought up; and if they depart from service before the end of their term, or refuse to serve for the wages limited by the statute, they shall be committed, &c. In addition to this, the justices of the sessions are authorized, annually, to rate and fix the wages to be received by the labouring people, whether manufacturers, mechanics, or husbandmen; and if any person shall offer, or give, greater wages than those rated as aforesaid, he shall forfeit five pounds, half to the king and half to him that shall sue. If any person employed, shall take wages contrary to the statute, and be thereof convicted, he shall be imprisoned for twenty-one days without bail. The hours of work are fixed, from five in the morning, till seven at night, from March to September, and the remainder of the year, from the spring of the day in the morning, until night, allowing half an hour for breakfast, and one hour for dinner. If either of them assault their master, they shall be imprisoned for a year or less, at the discretion of two justices out of session. All combinations of workmen for regulating trade, or for settling the price of goods, or for advancing their wages, or for lessening the usual hours of work, are declared void, and all concerned, on conviction by the oath of one witness, shall be committed to the house of correction.

This is a brief outline of some of the oppressive measures adopted by the statesmen of England, "who

never for a moment thought of following the plausible theories of the Adam Smiths and M. Says." It is not by the mere exclusion of foreign manufactures, therefore, that Great Britain is enabled to export such quantities, and to sell them at a price, comparatively low; but by measures, revolting to the feelings of humanity—by which, the labouring classes are compelled to abide in the parish of their birth, and neither to leave that, or their country, however hard their fate, or however cheering the prospect of a change of residence.—By refusing them work, unless they engage for a year; and when thus engaged, compelling them to receive the wages fixed by the justices of the peace, founded on the information of those who are to employ them, and to be benefitted by their labour.—By placing in the hands of the master manufacturer, a controlling power over the workman, which compels such workman to engage with any who may require it, if not previously engaged, or if poor, and not in possession of a stipulated amount of property; and by fixing the number of hours out of the twenty-four that the labourer must work, leaving him barely sufficient time to take his meals, and recruit his strength, by sleep. Now, permit me to inquire, are you prepared to recommend measures of this description, in order that this nation may rival England in her manufactures?

There is no knowing to what extent the thirst for riches, distinction, and power may carry the heads of these manufacturing establishments. You have hinted already, what we are to expect, when you say "the farming interest have only to say the word, and their representatives in Congress will adopt measures which

shall soon give them manufacturers, and safe home-markets for their produce." In your opinion, therefore, with the assistance of the farming interest, the manufacturers may now carry their measures through Congress ; and if their influence is, at this time, so extensive, what will it be when they shall have the control of the thousands of votes, that, should the monopoly of the cloth-making business be granted them, will be dependent upon their will? We have seen, by the proceedings of the Harrisburgh Convention, that a combination of interests has been formed to force the constituted authorities to a compliance with their demands; and we have no reason to doubt, therefore, that, whenever the same description of persons shall conceive it to be their interest, to insist upon the adoption of measures, similar to those adopted by their great prototype, England, they will again combine for the purpose ; and your assertion that, "by adopting the same policy here, we shall find that a like cause will produce the same effect," may be literally verified. To ward off a calamity so portentous, is the duty of every man in the community, who is a friend to the rights of his species, and wishes to perpetuate and preserve the free institutions under which we live, and under which we are not only a prosperous, but a happy people, whatever the interested capitalists, or the great landholders may say to the contrary.

You have dwelt, in several parts of your work, on the protection given to our shipping ; and you appear to insist, that much more has been done for the interests of commerce than what has been done for that of manufactures. "The great preference compelled and enforced by Congress, to be given to the ships

and shipping interests of this country, for a time bore hard upon the farming and landed interest." In referring so frequently to this subject, you evidently view it as the strongest argument you are enabled to adduce in favour of your prohibitory system; but, foreign ships were not excluded our ports, neither were the discriminating duties so high as to prevent them entering into competition with our own vessels; for, while these duties were in full operation, from 1789 to 1805, the foreign tonnage entering our ports comprised more than one-fifth of the whole. As our own tonnage increased, however, the foreign diminished; and now, when the treaties with Great Britain and other nations, authorize the entry of foreign vessels upon the same terms as our own, the foreign tonnage has been reduced from one-fifth, to about one-tenth of the whole. It is believed, that the following are the discriminating duties, so much spoken of, and so often alluded to. The rate of duties, on goods imported, if it be thirty per centum in an American vessel, will be thirty-three in a foreign vessel; and if it be fifteen per centum in an American vessel, it will be sixteen and a half in a foreign vessel. Now, let us see what has been done for the manufacturer of woollens: he has a discriminating duty of thirty-three and a third per centum on the cost of the goods at a foreign port, with ten per cent. added, besides the expense of shipping the merchandise, the freight across the atlantic, and the cost of insurance; so that a yard of cloth, that could be purchased of the factor in England for exportation at four dollars, will cost, when landed here and all expenses paid, about eight dollars. It would seem, there-

fore, that much more has been done for the encouragement of the manufacturer than what has been done for that of the shipping. How this small discriminating duty in favour of our own vessels, has "bore hard upon the farming or landed interest," I am unable to perceive. That the prosperity of these interests are owing almost altogether to the enterprise of our ship-owners, cannot be doubted. It is they who sought out a market for the productions of the soil, gave life and animation to the farmer, by the purchase of his produce, and have caused the wilderness to disappear, and cultivation to be extended in its stead. The products of our land have been carried to regions almost unknown before, and articles brought back in exchange, of immense value ; and such of these articles as were not required here, have again been exported to countries where they were in demand ; and thus have the United States been enriched by the enterprise and skill of her merchants. What would have been the fate of the farming interest, if they had only depended on foreign vessels to take off their produce ? The maritime nations, who might be in want of the produce, would probably take off a part of it ; but, would foreign vessels search out new and unheard-of markets for it, as has been the case, in numerous instances with the American ? I think not. The truth is, that the farmer owes his prosperity altogether to the enterprise of the merchant ; and while the landed interest, and the farmer, have been extending their possessions, and increasing in wealth, the merchant, in too many instances, has been compelled to declare himself insolvent, and to turn his attention to other pursuits, in order that his family might obtain a

subsistence. "The dispute with England, whether the ships of this country should, on equal terms with their own, transport plaster from, and rye and Indian corn to Nova-Scotia ; and rum and molasses from, and corn, flour, and lumber to the West Indies, was mainly the cause of the extreme depression of flour in the years 1820 and '21."

The dispute with England, on the subject of our trade with her colonies, is a matter of vital importance to that country. The great expense incurred by that government, in establishing, fostering, and protecting her colonies, appears to require, that she should have the full benefit of their trade. It is with this object solely, that they are kept in dependence on the mother country ; and it is the trade with these colonies, that enables her to dispose of a large portion of her surplus manufactures, and in return, to receive their produce, and distribute it, by the shipping of the mother country, to the nations of Europe and elsewhere. The English government, therefore, have always contended, that, whenever a privilege was given to a foreign nation to trade with their colonies, it is always granted, either for an equivalent of equal or greater value, or as a boon ; and that no government has a right to claim this privilege, on any other terms. Our government have thought differently, and, therefore, it is, that we are now deprived of the trade with the English colonies, which we might have had, on nearly equitable terms, if the offers made by the English ministry had been acceded to. The loss of a direct trade to these colonies, has, no doubt, had some effect in depressing the price of flour ; but, I cannot think with you, "that it was the main cause of the extreme

depression of flour in the years 1820 and '21," or that it is the cause of the present depression, if you consider the now market price a depressed one. The fluctuations, in the price of flour, are brought about by the same causes, as are the fluctuations in the price of all articles of merchandise; namely, the quantity and demand. The change of price will, of course, be more frequent while we depend upon a foreign market for the disposal of a part of our produce, and less frequent, when the whole of our flour and bread-stuffs are consumed at home; or when we shall become a miserable manufacturing nation, like the English, and when we shall prohibit the exportation of flour and grain, in order that the farmer may be enabled to obtain a high price for what he raises, and thus, pay his rents to the "*landed interest*," and his taxes to the government; while the wages of the manufacturing labourer shall be reduced, to the lowest possible sum, by his employer, that will grant him and his family a bare subsistence upon hoe cake and water. Then we shall be enabled to boast of the wealth, power, and the glory of America; but, we hope those times are far distant.

I am unable to trace the variation in the price of flour, by any reference in my possession, at present; but I observe it stated in Niles' Register, that the price of the best flour at Baltimore, in September, 1820, was \$4.75; and in October, 1821, it is quoted at \$6. In addition to this, I observe that the exportation of flour in 1820 and '21, was about the average of the preceding and succeeding years, being 1,056,119 bls. in 1820; and 827,865 bls. in 1821. The depression, therefore, has not been so extreme as you appear to

think it ; and although the price was a little below a fair average in 1820, as it is, perhaps, now, (the quotation for September, ranging from \$4.75, to \$5.12,) it cannot be altogether owing to the loss of the trade with the British colonies ; because they are still supplied, indirectly, with flour and bread stuffs from this country, through the medium of the Danish, Dutch, and French islands, and the several contiguous ports of South America ; and this method of supply, I should suppose, must not only be more precarious than the direct one, but must cost the colonies more ; and, consequently, it is a state of things that cannot last long.

“The objection to giving protection to manufactures, you say, comes with an ill grace from the ship owners, who, from a like protection to their ships, have become rich.” The ship owners, so far as I have ascertained their sentiments, do not object to giving protection to manufactures ; their objection is to your proposition, to “*shut out manufactured articles ;*” and it is the opinion of the best informed merchants, that the protection now granted to manufactures, is at least equal, if not greater, than what is granted to the shipping interest, which I have already attempted to illustrate by a comparison of the duties imposed on foreign vessels, and manufactured articles. The discriminating duties on foreign vessels, commenced with the present government of the United States. In 1790, the American tonnage employed in foreign trade, amounted only to 354,767 tons, while the vessels owned by British subjects, which entered our ports, amounted to 216,914 tons. By the enterprise of our ship owners, however, the skill of our ship-builders, and the nautical information and expertness of our

mariners, we have increased our tonnage and trade, so that in 1815, it amounted to 700,035 tons, while at the same time, the tonnage of British vessels which entered our ports that year, only amounted to 142,710 tons. In 1822, the American tonnage in foreign trade, amounted to 810,761 tons; and the British was reduced to 89,819. This increase of our commerce, and exclusion of foreign vessels, has not been caused by the protecting duties on ships, as you will have it; for it appears, that for several years after these duties were imposed, the vessels employed in our trade, by British owners, amounted to more than 200,000 tons, annually. The true cause was, the increase of capital, knowledge, and enterprise of our merchants and seamen. The same result will, no doubt, follow the steady and persevering application of the manufacturer to his business. This, in a manner, has already occurred, as you are compelled to admit, though with evident reluctance, when you say, “It is maintained by some of the oldest and most forward manufacturers, whose establishments had their rise in the early stages of the embargo, *that manufactures do not require further protection in this country.*” There can be but little doubt of the fact, that the old established manufacturers are doing well; and that the hue and cry raised for additional duties, or the total exclusion of manufactured articles, comes from the owners of the “innumerable water-falls,” or the great land owners, or capitalists of the eastern states;—men, who have no knowledge of the business, and whose only object is, to break down individual exertion, by the overpowering operations of their large capitals; and, by which, they may hope to monopolize the whole

business to themselves, and reign lords of the villages where their establishments may be located.

I am led to believe, that the factories that are now in successful operation, have had more difficulties and drawbacks to contend with, and which they have surmounted, than any of the difficulties now existing, tending to retard the late establishments. The foreign workmen who came to this country during the embargo, pretended to a knowledge they did not possess, and the business intrusted to them, was not only badly executed, but much of the machinery prepared by their direction, and at great cost, was found to be useless; hence the ruin of many establishments which bid fair to be prosperous at their commencement. Our manufacturers are now aware of the deceptions to which they have been liable, and are reaping that benefit from their capital and experience, which was, in the first stages, lost to them, for the want of knowledge. A late writer, on this subject observes, as follows:—"The principal part of the manufacture of wool and cotton, is now performed by native hands; and although I feel grateful for all the information received from Europeans, this is as it should be. Still, there is too much want of information among principals, and too much intrusted to agents. Our principals too seldom make the practical part of their business their study, and confine themselves to the sale-rooms, and making purchases. This I have deemed a wrong policy, as nothing but the head and hands of the principals can counteract the bad management of their workmen." This truth is self-evident, that no man can conduct a business advantageously, unless he understands it, and gives it the necessary attention.

Let those, therefore, who wish to enter into the manufacturing business, obtain the necessary information, before they commence, and there cannot be a doubt, but, with the present duties on foreign articles, in their favour, they will succeed, and obtain as fair a profit on their capital and industry, as can be realized from any other pursuit.

You have quoted a passage from Colquhoun, that “contrary to the general received opinion, the number of paupers in those counties chiefly agricultural, greatly exceeds those where manufactories prevail.” This extract is presented for the purpose of doing away the objection, that “manufactories have a tendency to debase and demoralize the community, to increase criminality, and the number of paupers.” I have no reason to doubt, that the observation of Colquhoun is true, although I am not in possession of his work, and cannot, therefore, refer to the reasons he may have assigned for this result. It is not difficult to account, however, why it is, that the paupers, crimes, and poor rates of the agricultural counties, were greater than the manufacturing. It is believed, that a majority of the hands employed in the English factories, are supplied from the agricultural counties. The children of the poor peasantry, and cottagers, are sent to the manufacturing establishments of the adjoining town, or county, and their small earnings, either go to their parents, or the children are taken on condition of furnishing them food and clothing. It is said to be a fact, that there are persons residing in the manufacturing towns, who make a business of collecting children from the country, to work in the factories. They are supplied with a recommendation from the

owner of the works, that the children will be well treated, &c. ; and when they have collected the requisite number, the manufacturer allows them a stipulated sum for the labour of the children, they finding them their board and clothing. These children never gain a settlement in the manufacturing district, as they are not apprenticed ; and, if they fall sick, or become chargeable, they are returned to the county where their parents reside. The poor laws of England are similar to what ours were before the late amendments. The settlement of the child is that of the parent ; and a settlement by removal cannot be gained, except by renting a tenement of the yearly value of ten pounds sterling, with other restrictions, which prevents the removal of the poor from one parish to another, &c. It is the operation of these poor laws in England, that is the cause of this excess of crime and pauperism in the agricultural counties. The manufacturers take off their children to work in their factories ; and after they have worn them out, debauched them, and ruined their constitutions, they return them to the county where their legal settlement is. It is no wonder, then, that the poor-rates of these agricultural counties should be high ; that the paupers should be increased, or, that even the criminal cases should be greater, than in the manufacturing. In order that this subject may be placed in a clearer point of view, I will extract a passage from Bell's Weekly Messenger of 1819, as follows :—" Mr. S. Bourn had unsuccessfully proposed a bill in Parliament, the object of which was, that all who reside three years in any parish should be settled in such parish ; or, in other words, that the manufacturing towns and districts should support their own

old and sick poor. Accordingly, all the manufacturing districts have, to a man, united in opposition against it; and by a private address to every member of parliament, singly, have actually succeeded in throwing it out. The complaint of the landed interest is, that they have to pay the poor-rates for the manufacturing labourers; that the manufacturers not only employ and wear out the men, but, as it were, produce, and call into existence a mendicant population; and, after they have had the best days of the labourer, and encourage him to marry and rear a large family, they return him unto the parish from whence they first took him." Thus, it appears, that the cause of this pauperism and crime in the agricultural districts, is the baneful effects upon the morals and constitutions of the subjects, consequent on their association with the manufacturing establishments; and this ought to be a lesson to our farmers, not to listen to the siren song of "home market, home market," but to be contented with their happy, and, comparatively, enviable situation; for whatever may be said to the contrary, there is no situation in life so happy, so independent, and so free from care, all things considered, as that of the American farmer.

It is impossible, that any gentleman who has paid so much attention to the subject as you have, should be ignorant of the fact, that even in our own factories there is a great demoralization of character among the labourers. How can it be otherwise, where there is so little restraint upon the conduct, such a mixture of the sexes at the various occupations, and so little opportunity for instruction, admonition, and virtuous example for imitation? I have been credibly in-

formed, that in some of our cotton factories, the English system is so far followed, that the mills are in perpetual motion. That one set of children work in the factories from morning to night, when they are relieved by another, who work from night till morning, leaving them barely time to eat and sleep, and, of course, no time for instruction, except on the Sabbath; and whether any attention is paid to them on that day I am not informed. My informant stated further, that he knew a man, who conducted one of the factories as an overseer, that had declared, there were fifteen girls in his establishment, who would not refuse him any thing he requested of them! But, say you, "there exists no natural cause for this result." The taking of 50 or 100 children from under the protection of their parents, and placing them in an establishment, where no attention is paid to them, except to keep them steadily at their work, both day and night, has no tendency then to demoralize! Facts in abundance might be quoted from English writers, going to prove the demoralizing effects of large manufacturing establishments; but it is believed, that those already referred to are sufficient to satisfy every disinterested inquirer. I beg leave, however, to quote a few lines from a writer in Niles' Register, of July, 1826, from whose work I have already made an extract.

"Our factories are, in a great measure, spread over a large surface of country; and for the order, harmony, and welfare of the community, long may they continue so." This writer saw, that by collecting our manufacturing population into villages and towns, instead of their being, in a manner, insulated, as they, in a great measure, are now, that the order, har-

mony, and welfare of the community would suffer. Whether he alluded to the increase of immorality, or the tendency of such a community to riot and commotion, is immaterial; he evidently was of opinion, from his own experience, for he appears to be a manufacturer, that the operatives of those establishments were of a character by no means calculated to improve a community, or to be brought together in large masses, with advantage to morality and good order. Doctor Griscom, on visiting one of the cloth manufactories in England, observes, "the practice of continuing the manufactories throughout the night, has lately been adopted in England, to a considerable extent. It enables the owners to turn their capital to greater advantage, and it affords opportunities to the workmen, to exert their industry to the utmost extent of their capacity. These considerations are, however, on the score of humanity, extremely objectionable. A large proportion of the persons employed in these factories, it is well known, are children. What pecuniary advantage can possibly compensate for the loss of health and morals, which these poor creatures unavoidably sustain, by such midnight toil and exposure? It is true, they work by relays, and are permitted to take a certain share of repose and relaxation; but when such temptations are held out to the avarice, or indolence, of unenlightened parents, nothing but the strictest regulations of a humane owner, or master, can afford sufficient protection to these juvenile labourers. The employment of both sexes in the same crowded factory, is found to be inevitably attended with demoralizing effects; no caution can entirely obviate the evil. and it is to be feared, that remedial regulations

are, in many cases, greatly neglected." This is the observation of a man of the first respectability and integrity, who saw with his own eyes, the effects of the manufacturing system upon those employed in them; that it is found, inevitably, attended with demoralizing effects. After this, it is to be hoped, that you will no longer insist, "that the natural tendency (of manufacturing employment) must be to improve the habits of the people to virtue."

The enthusiasm you have displayed in support of this English system, is worthy of a much better cause. That you are sincere, I have no reason to doubt; and still it is strange, that any man with all his senses about him, should consider it a calamity to the country, if England was to repeal her prohibitory laws, and permit the free importation of the products of our soil!

The American farmers, whom you profess to befriend, by providing a market for their produce, better than that they now enjoy, and to which class you claim to belong, (which, by the bye, I am unwilling to admit,) must be as much surprised as I am at this opinion of yours; and every philanthropic man, who would rejoice at an event that would give to the population of England an opportunity to purchase our bread-stuffs and provisions at a price far below what they at present are compelled to pay, must regret that a sentiment so devoid of humanity should be promulgated. Here are your words:—

"I should consider it a great misfortune, if England should again admit our bread-stuffs, provisions, and raw materials. It would have a tendency to prevent us, for a long time, from rising to that solid and permanent elevation, to which, by her policy, we are now

fast approaching, and to which we may very soon attain *by proper management*." Perhaps the best answer I can make to this rhapsody, is to quote an observation of your own, applied to the old established manufacturers; when they said, "no further protection from government is necessary." Here it is—"It is with difficulty, this opinion can be reconciled with pure intentions. In the absence of all necessary proof, we are led to attribute it to the overbearing influence of self-interested motives."

You have taken great pains to impress upon the minds of your readers, the opinion, that they are poor; and for fear that the idea should be lost sight of, I presume, you have repeated the assertion five or six times, and on as many different occasions; on one of which you state, that the governments that have conformed to the English maxims, have become rich—under ours we have become poor. You then name Spain, Portugal, Poland, and our own governments, as poor.

It is really astonishing, that you should attempt to compare the condition of this country with that of Poland, Spain, and Portugal, when, in reality, between them and us, there is so little resemblance, either in the information or enterprise of the people, the form of government, or the resources of the country.

Where, let me ask, is the evidence of our poverty? Is it an evidence of poverty in the general government, that they have been enabled to lessen the national debt more than five millions annually, and that without the imposition of taxes or new loans; while your wealthy government of England, is drawing from the subject more than half his income by direct taxa-

tion, and are still unable to discharge the current expenses of the nation without new loans, by means of exchequer bills, navy bills, and ordnance bills? Or, is it an evidence of poverty in this State, that the expenses of government have been disbursed for the last two years without taxes of any sort, during which time, ninety thousand dollars has been appropriated for the building a new State's Prison, at Mount Pleasant, in Westchester, and probably as much more for other public improvements in other parts of the State. In 1820 the valuation of the whole real and personal estate, in this State, was about 250 millions of dollars; and in 1825 it was rising 300 millions. In 1820 the whole real and personal estate of the City of New-York was 69,530,753 dollars, and in 1825 it was 101,160,046 dollars. Is this an indication of poverty? You have, to be sure, told us a lamentable story about the slaughter of sheep; that more than fifteen hundred have been killed within a mile and a half of your house, and that you had bought an entire carcass, neatly dressed, for 62½ cents. In answer, I can only say, that you are more fortunate than we are who are compelled to give as much for a single quarter, as you have for a whole sheep; and it would be a friendly act in you, to advise the farmers, to bring their mutton to this market hereafter, and not sell it to the people of Troy, who give them not much more than the one-fourth of the value of the article. You assign as a reason why the sheep are killed, "because we have not the necessary number of cloth makers for working the wool into cloth." By which you mean us to understand, that there is not a fair demand for wool, in order to encourage the farmer to preserve his sheep for the sake of the wool. Those

better acquainted with the subject, however, differ with you, for I find, that on the 14th of September, 1826, which, I judge, was about the time you bought your cheap mutton, a meeting of manufacturers was held in Boston, in order to an application to Congress for an increase of duties on woollens. Among other grievances they complain of the high duty on foreign wool. "The duty on imported wool, say they, is thirty per cent. The charges about twenty per cent. more. The price of American is regulated entirely by the price of foreign wool in our markets ; *for the quantity of the former (the American) is totally inadequate to supply the consumption of the manufactories now in operation* ; and numerous establishments have been erected which have, as yet, wrought no wool, and which, if the proprietors put them in operation, will require large quantities, and the manufacturers generally must depend on supplies of foreign wool for consumption. From these facts, then, it would seem, that the American manufacturer pays fifty per cent. more for wool than the English manufacturer. Large quantities of wool have been imported from time to time, during the year, direct from England, and paid, not only the charges and duties of fifty per cent., as above stated, but a profit to the importer besides. When Congress last undertook the revision of the tariff, it was avowedly for the purpose of affording additional protection to the woollen manufactures of the country. What was done for their relief? Fifteen per cent. was added to the wool ; a measure better calculated to ruin the manufacturers of woollens could not easily have been devised." Thus it appears, that you, and your Boston friends are at issue. They say,

and I have no doubt with truth, that the quantity of wool raised in this country is totally inadequate to supply the consumption, while you maintain, that the demand is so limited, that the farmers are compelled to destroy their sheep. They say, that the price of American wool is regulated entirely by the price of foreign, which is more than fifty per centum advance on what the article is bought for in England, while you contend, that the receipts of the farmer for the article, are so small, as to discourage him from raising it. They say, that the present duty on foreign wool is calculated to ruin the manufacturer ; yet we find, that your Harrisburgh Convention have decided, that this duty shall be raised, instead of diminished. This one act of the Convention, I should suppose, ought to open the eyes of the farmers, to the snare which is laid for them, by these interested manufacturers. They are willing that, for the present, the duty on foreign wool shall be raised, in order that they may draw the farmer to their interest, and by that means, carry their project of excluding foreign cloths, or increasing the duty, to an amount that will operate as an exclusion of the article. That once effected, and we shall see them meeting and combining for the purpose of obtaining a reduction of duty on wool, and, perhaps, a prohibition of its exportation, either in fleece or on the sheep, which is the policy of England, as I understand it. If the manufacturer can now afford to purchase foreign wool, with the present duty and charges of fifty per cent. on its cost, and pay the farmers the same price for the American, which they say is always regulated by the price of foreign, and if the farmers are compelled to kill off their stock of sheep, because the price is so low, what will be the conse-

quence, when the price of foreign wool shall be reduced, by a reduction of the duties, to an amount nearly nominal, as it is now in England? There must, however, have been some other cause for the killing of sheep, than any you have assigned; for in addition to the evidence of these manufacturers, who declare, that the quantity of American wool is totally inadequate to supply the consumption, I find, that the American sheep have been in considerable demand for exportation. In 1820 there were 11,117 sheep exported, the value of which is stated at 22,175 dollars. In 1822 there were 6,880 sheep exported, valued at 15,029 dollars, and in 1824 there were 9,681 exported, the value of which is stated at 20,027 dollars. Is it not strange, therefore, that with this ample demand for the wool, if we are to credit the Boston memorialists, added to the sale of sheep, annually, for exportation, that your neighbours should find it to be their interest to kill off fifteen hundred, and that within a few days, as you say, “merely for the sake of the fleece and tallow, and leaving the carcass to rot, or be devoured, by beasts or birds of prey”?

In the first part of your work, you have discarded the opinions of Adam Smith, J. B. Say, and others, as plausible theories; but, in your Essay, we find you quoting profusely from these authors, only such detached passages from their works, however as in your opinion, will tend to strengthen your argument in favour of the monopolists.

You commence, by a quotation from Smith's *Wealth of Nations*; but omit to state the subject he is treating on. It is the rise and progress of cities and towns. The cause of their rise, under the feudal system, is

stated to be the jealousy existing between the great Barons and the King. In order to strengthen his authority over these lords of the land, the King granted charters and other immunities to the burghers of the towns and cities. "Order and good government, and along with them the liberty and security of individuals, were in this manner established in cities at a time when the occupiers of land in the country, were exposed to every sort of violence." The security of the individual and his property naturally induced industry and the acquisition of wealth; and capital and products led to commerce and exchange. By importing the improved manufactures and expensive luxuries of richer countries, some food was afforded to the vanity of the great proprietors or barons, and a taste for the finer and more improved manufactures was, in this manner, introduced by foreign commerce; and when this taste became so general as to occasion a considerable demand, the merchants, in order to save the expense of carriage, naturally endeavoured to establish some manufactures of the same kind in their own country. "Hence the origin of the first manufactures for distant sale, that seem to have been established in the western provinces of Europe, after the fall of the Roman empire." Thus, he accounts for the establishment of manufactures of the finer sort; it was consequent upon foreign commerce, and the enterprise of the merchants; and lest he might be understood as saying, that no manufactures existed in the countries but those thus established, he proceeds to state, as you have quoted, that no large country ever did exist without some sort of manufactures being carried on in it; as the clothing and household furniture of the greater

part of the people are the product of their own industry, and that it is more commonly the case in *poor countries* without capital or surplus products, than with rich ones, that are said to abound with them.

He then proceeds to state, that manufactures of the finer sort are introduced into different countries, in two different ways. They are sometimes the offspring of foreign commerce. The seat of such manufactures, as they are generally introduced by the project of a few individuals, is sometimes established in a maritime city, and sometimes in an inland town, according as their interest or judgment happen to determine. At other times, manufactures grow up naturally, and as it were, of their own accord, by the gradual refinement of those coarser manufactures which must at all times be carried on. “Manufactures that establish themselves by degrees, and rise up as if naturally, are almost always in the best situations, and become prosperous. Those, on the contrary, which are erected at great expense, and on an extended plan, very often fail, or at least have but indifferent success.” For the sake of brevity, I have not used the exact words of Dr. Smith, except where I have marked them with inverted commas, but I am confident, that the sense of what he intended to express, is precisely conveyed; and taking the whole in connection, you are welcome to the use of it, if you should deem it, in any way, servicable to your cause.

The principal object you appear to have, in quoting the passage alluded to, is that you might have another opportunity to tell us, that we “fall within the grade of those denominated poor.” I have no doubt, you have persuaded yourself, that we actually are as poor and beggarly as you state us to be, and all proof

to the contrary, within my power to furnish, in addition to that already adduced, would not convince you of your error. The miser is said to be poor and beggarly, although he has much wealth in store ; but, his is the poverty of mind, and not of means. And there are such persons in being, who, with all the enjoyments of life about them, are still miserable and poor ; not because they are destitute of property, but because they have not the heart to enjoy it. These characters are eternally croaking about hard times, and are out of humour with all they meet, unless they chime in with their opinion. The poverty of a nation, however, is not to be judged of, by the opinions of persons, such as I have described, any more than the poverty of an individual is to be judged of by his sordidness.

To arrive at the conclusion you have, as to our poverty in a national point of view, we must believe with you, that the people of this country are in the condition of the miser, or of those whose mental poverty will not permit them to enjoy the blessings which Providence has spread before them ; for if any people on the face of this earth can be said to be rich in the enjoyment of all the blessings of a good government, salubrious atmosphere, and productive soil, it is the people of the United States.

It may be well, perhaps, to take a passing note of the wretched governments, and more wretched subjects of those governments, to whom you have compared us.

The original government of Poland is said to have been an elective monarchy. Early in the Christian era, however, the feudal form of government was introduced, when the influence of the Roman Catholic

clergy, with the arbitrary principles of the feudal system, gave an easy victory to the clergy and nobility over the liberties of the people, and they sunk into a state of servitude, from which they never afterwards emerged. The nation has no existence now, but in name ; its territory and people having long since been divided between Russia, Austria, and Prussia.

This is one of the governments to which you would liken us.—A government under which both the person and property of the subject, are at the service of a master ; and the increase of property is a signal for its immediate confiscation by the ruling lord : and if they “ export at the rate of ten thousand of wheat annually,” it is probably done by the owners of the land, and not by those who till it ; in the same manner, that the Pacha of Egypt exports cotton, and other products of his dominion. The government of Egypt is no more a despotism than those you have alluded to. “ The Pacha does not suffer his peasantry to cultivate what they please ; they must do what they are ordered ; what the Pacha orders to be sown, that must be sowed.”

The governments of Spain and Portugal are absolute and hereditary monarchies, with an established priesthood of the Roman Catholic persuasion, amounting to several hundred thousand. In the former of these governments, commerce, agriculture, and manufactures once flourished ; but, on the expulsion of the Moors and Jews from Spain, enterprise ceased, and industry was discouraged. The imperious dons were too proud to work, and held in utter contempt all kinds of the arts ; and the same spirit has been perpetuated to the present day. The imbecility and fanaticism of the government ; the royal monopoly of

a great portion of the trade; the great quantity of land appropriated as forests for hunting, and sheep-walks for the flocks of the nobles; the want of good roads; the multiplicity of the feasts and holy days, lessening the days for labour, nearly one-third; together with the ignorance, indolence, and superstition of the people generally, are among the causes which have impeded the prosperity of that country. The same causes nearly, that have operated to debase the people of Spain, are operating in Portugal. The whole commerce and trade of that country, is in the hands of foreigners, and except in name, the kingdom may be considered a colony to England, who furnish the nation with foreign commodities, loan them money to disburse their war expenses, and fight their battles for them whenever they are pressed hard by an enemy. The peasantry of both countries remain the miserable vassals of the nobility and gentry, or owners of the soil, and of course, have no will but that of their master, and no manner of inducement to increase their possessions or to exert their talents and ingenuity, to perfect the arts, or better their condition. Now, where can we find the least resemblance between the government and people of these countries, and the people and government of the United States, either in the equity of laws, the information, freedom of opinion, ingenuity, enterprise, and industry of the people, or the equitable spur given to that industry by the government? There is no comparison, and it is absurd to attempt to compare us with any of the despotic governments of Europe, and particularly with Spain, Portugal, and Poland.

And wherein, you ask, is America to be likened to

Poland? Your answer is, because neither of them duly appreciate, encourage, and protect manufacturing industry. How you can reconcile this answer of yours, with what you had previously admitted, that our government have given especial protection and encouragement to certain branches of business in this country, particularly the coarse cotton cloth making, &c. is beyond my comprehension. The reader may contrast it also, with your admittal, that some of the oldest and most forward manufacturers of cloth, maintain that no further protection is required, and also with the fact, that our present manufacturers, are not only able to supply a considerable amount of the home consumption, but to furnish for exportation more than six millions in value. See treasurer's report of December, 1826.

It may be proper to make one general remark, upon the numerous quotations you have made from the writers on political economy, and which compose about the one-third of your "Essay," and the use you have made of them. You name Smith, Ricardo, McCulloch, and Say. These gentlemen were, all of them, natives and inhabitants of manufacturing countries; three of them of the country which you hold up to us as a pattern to be followed, and where manufactures are more extensive than in any other known country on this globe. You cannot doubt their veracity, information, or disinterestedness, and you admit, that they hold opinions diametrically opposite to yours. The opinions of these great men, as spread through their works, are opposed to any special patronage or protection to manufactures, because it is taxing the many for the benefit of the few; and because, where

the ingenuity, skill and industry of the people are free and unrestrained, it only requires time, and the natural inducements, to increase in substance, and to acquire wealth, in order to bring to perfection the mechanic and manufacturing arts; and because, the forcing these establishments into existence, by bounties and exclusions, tends to increase the wealth of the capitalists, while it depresses the condition of the operators, multiplies the number of paupers, and eventually, debases, and demoralizes the community.

The authors of these works, residing in the vicinity of the large manufacturing establishments, were the better able to judge of their tendency,—the evils of which they have portrayed; and when we consider the influence possessed by the owners of these establishments, as already shown, it is matter of surprise, that men of sufficient independence were found, who, in the face of this influence, demonstrated to the world, the unequal and injurious tendency of the measures adopted to protect and foster these monopolies.

You admit, that the leading principles of these writers are opposed to your English system, and still you quote from their works, detached sections and paragraphs, in order to represent them, as opposing in one place, what they had advocated in another; when you know, that by taking their works as a whole, their reasoning and conclusions are not only consistent with each other, but unanswerable.

Thus, whenever a sentence can be selected favourable to manufactures, you seize upon it, as an evidence that their views corresponded with yours; when the fact is, that in no parts of their works, have they attempted to oppose manufactures. Their op-

position is to the monopolizing system you are contending for, and in favour, as every reasonable man is, of manufactures that grow into existence by the knowledge, intelligence, and industry of those who conduct them.

There are a number of your quotations, which I am unable to find, by the reference you have given ; thus, you refer us to Smith, Book 1, Chap. 2d, for two of your first quotations. To M. Say, vol. 1, pages 32, 128, 138, and 140, neither of which are to be found, at least a, those pages ; but, in turning over the work, in search of your selections, I lit upon the following, which I cannot avoid extracting for your edification.

“By the absolute exclusion of specific manufactures of foreign fabric, a government establishes a monopoly in favour of the home producer of those articles, and in prejudice of the home consumer ; that is to say, those classes of the nation which produce them, being entitled to their exclusive sale, can raise their price above the natural rate ; while the home consumers, being unable to purchase elsewhere, are compelled to pay for them unnaturally dear. If the article be not wholly prohibited, but merely saddled with an import duty, the home producer can then increase their price by the whole amount of the duty, and the consumer will have to pay the difference. For example, if an import duty of one dollar per dozen be laid upon earthen plates, worth three dollars per dozen, the importer, whatever country he may belong to, must charge the consumer four dollars ; and the home manufacturer of that commodity is enabled to ask four dollars per dozen of his customers for plates of the same quality ; which he could not do without the intervention of the duty ;

because, the consumer could get the same article for three dollars ; thus a premium to the whole extent of the duty is given to the home manufacturer out of the consumer's pocket."

"Who, then, are the classes of the community so importunate for prohibitions, or heavy import duties ? The producers of the particular commodity, that apply for protection from competition,—not the consumers of that commodity. The public interest is their plea ; but self interest is evidently their object. Well, but, say these gentry, are they not the same thing ? Are not our gains national gains ? By no means : whatever profit is acquired in this manner, is so much taken out of the pockets of a neighbour and fellow-citizen ; and if the excess of charge thrown on consumers by the monopoly could be correctly computed, it would be found, that the loss of the consumer exceeds the gain of the monopolists. Here, then, individual and public interest are in direct opposition to each other ; and, since public interest is understood by the enlightened few alone, is it at all surprising, that the prohibitive system should find so many partizans and so few opposers ?"

These are the sentiments of all the writers on political economy that I have consulted. Smith, Say, McCulloch and Boileau, have shown the injurious effects upon the mass of the nation, of these monopolies, granted to particular branches of industry. The conclusive reasoning with which they have supported their opinions ; the baneful results of the system as experienced in England, admitted by every disinterested person, and the experience, though brief, in our own country, must strike the common sense of every man,

and induce him to oppose the selfish policy, so strenuously advocated by the interested few.

You appear to think, that nobody is opposed to this selfish policy of your land-holding, and manufacturing friends, except the ship holders, southern planters, chambers of commerce, shop-keepers, and along-shore merchants, including British commercial agents and factors. In this you are much mistaken; for I doubt, whether there is a disinterested and benevolent minded man in the nation, who fully understands the subject, that is willing to join you, to the extent which you are disposed to carry the matter. Whatever may be the opinion of the classes you have selected for censure, you may be assured, that all that class of citizens who are spending their time and substance for the relief of the poor, the instruction of their offspring, and the general benefit of the people are opposed to you. Their voice, however, is scarcely heard, while the interested, who are always the most persevering and clamorous, generally carry their measures by acclamation.

You are particularly severe upon the shipping interest, and charge them with advising "us farmers" "and land men, to purchase foreign manufactures with their raw produce; while that same shipping interest, with all their boasted activity, cannot find foreign purchasers for one half the raw produce which might be raised." You will not deny, however, it is presumed, that the shipping interest have found a market for all that the farmers had to spare, of what they raised; for if otherwise, permit me to inquire, what becomes of the immense and increasing quantity of bread stuffs and provisions of every kind, that has been transmitted to

the commercial mart of the state, since the completion of the Canals? Does any of it lay rotting on hand, as you sometimes intimate? If it does, you have given us no proof of the fact, neither do we think, you are able to prove it. This we do know, that there is none running to waste, or rotting in store, for want of purchasers, in the City of New-York. This rotting of goods on hand, however, is an old story, frequently told in former times, whenever the political influence of the farmers was required, and it is now made use of, because the same influence is wanted for a different object; but the sound and discriminating minds of the American farmers are not to be deceived on the present occasion, any more than they were on the former.

“Us farmers.” It must be amusing to the real farmers of our country, the independent owners and tillers of the soil, to hear you talk about “us farmers,” “brother farmers,” and “we farmers.” A gentleman with an independent fortune, with large landed property, it is true, consisting of farms and “superabundant waterfalls now running to waste,” town houses and country houses, stocks and cash, and who only, if I am correctly informed, cultivates a few acres of land as a pasture and garden, classing himself as a farmer!! Was all this wealth amassed by farming? If it was, then it is a decided proof that the business is not so beggarly a one, as you represent it to be; and if it was made by trade, or speculation, then, me thinks, you ought to be a little more merciful to the trading part of the community, and not charge them, merely because they are traders, with hostility to manufactures, and because they are not willing to give a large portion

of their earnings towards the support of a monopoly, when they believe that, monopolies of every kind are injurious to the fair trader, in all countries, and particularly in this.

You appear to be much pleased with the king of Prussia, another absolute monarch, because he kept wagons moving along the frontiers of France, to take away artizans, &c. to set up their trades in his kingdom, and for laying restraints upon the introduction of foreign manufactured articles. "These and other wise measures enlarged the boundary of his towns and cities." This is not exactly correct, however; for the boundaries of his country, and consequently of his towns and cities, were enlarged by a most sanguinary war, which added Silicia and other parts of Germany to his dominions; and the partition of Poland, brought the best provinces of that country under his control. It is a pity that you are unable to find precedents for your system, other than from the governments under which the freedom of man is but a name; but the reason is plain: the very act of compelling a freeman to purchase articles he may want, from the manufacturer of the article here, and at any price he may choose to ask for it, is an act of tyranny, and therefore, it is, that precedents are only to be found in tyrannical governments, such as you have referred to.

The old and absurd story, that the English factories are kept in operation at the expense of the government, with the view of disgorging the products of their labours upon this country, I find is new vamped for exhibition, in your Essay. To believe, that the government of England, or the manufacturers of that

country, would dissipate their substance in making cloths and other articles, in order that we might be supplied with them at half what they cost, it too preposterous for a moment's consideration. I will leave you, therefore, in the full possession of your fancy on this subject, without attempting to prove its absurdity, which might be done with the greatest ease.

Your receipt for making broad cloth out of grain, mutton, turnips, potatoes, fuel, and building materials, is really worth preserving, and must be considered a great acquisition to the manufacturer. The following is the receipt. "Take from the farmer eighty pounds of wool, then several thousand weight of corn; put with these a large quantity of the farmer's mutton, turnips, potatoes, and some fuel, building materials, &c. Decoct the whole in the boiler of a dexterous manufacturer, and this mass of rude materials is converted into an elegant piece of broad-cloth." In order, however, that the farmer should be enabled to exchange these articles of produce for cloth, there is no real necessity that your system should be put in operation, by which he would be compelled to give two bushels of these turnips, &c., while now he is only compelled to give one; because, it is pretty clear, that the farmer will have to give one of the bushels for the monopoly of the manufacturer, when, as matters now stand, the competition of the foreign cloth, keeps the article at a fair price, and the present duty, of 33 and a third, allows our own manufactures a fair profit, and enables them to compete with the importer of the article, each operating as a check upon the other.

You now undertake to sum up, in your way, the important results that are to be produced by this process of making broad cloth. First, the farmer's debt

is to be paid off, say you. Yes, he will have to pay four dollars worth of his produce for what he can now have for two. Second, the shipping merchant will have his debt from the farmer, and his freight is to be increased by the increased quantity of goods used by him. Yes, the farmer will be much more able to pay his debts, when he is taxed to support the monopoly of the manufacturer, than now, when no such tax exists. And then he is to consume so much more sugar, molasses, tea, crockery, &c. that the ship owner's business is to be increased instead of diminished. Thus, the farmer, instead of living upon the wholesome diet of bread, meat, and milk, is to indulge, as you say, in the use of more sugar and molasses, &c. Truly his condition will be enviable, at any rate, his diet will be a sweet one.

Third, Government is to be enabled to obtain any quantity of cloth, in case of a war, instead of employing agents to procure it from the enemy, in violation of their own law. This is a heavy charge against the government, and before you ask our credence to such a charge, methinks, better proof ought to be adduced, than the mere word of any man. There can be no want of cloth, in the event of a war however, as our factories now in operation, will be fully sufficient for any exigency that may arise, and that, too, without additional duties.

Fourth—We are to have the manufacturers of England flocking over to us, and setting up their trades here. To be sure, if their government will let them come, and you ensure them the monopoly, by persuading our government to tax the citizens several millions annually, in order that the work now done in England

for us, may be done by the same hands here. Truly, as you say, "no trifling consequence, and to be by no means overlooked, or omitted, especially when it may be done with *advantage to ourselves*"—to wit, advantage, and sole advantage too, of ourselves, the manufacturers, owners of water falls, &c.

I will pass without notice, your attempt to put words in the mouths of our shipping merchants, such as would better become any of the despots you have eulogised, than for one free citizen to use to another.

You say, that "the farmer finds it impossible to put his rude produce through any other process, *whereby to be relieved from his present distress*, but that of the manufacturer." You have so often insisted upon the distress of our farmers, that I am induced to give you a proof to the contrary, which ought to silence you, and those who agree with you on that subject, for ever hereafter. The following certificate comes from a source that will not admit of cavil. The signers are farmers, and the officers of a society, established in our own state, and the certificate has lately been published, by their order, in the "Utica Sentinel;" it is as follows:

CERTIFICATE.

We hereby certify, that the Brookfield Farmers' Society was organized in 1824, under a voluntary and free constitution; in which year they sent to the New-York market over

40,000 lbs. of cheese; 1,000 lbs. of Butter.

1825—50,000 lbs. do. 2,200 lbs. do.

1826—88,000 lbs. do. 3,000 lbs. do.

at a saving of from one to one and a half cents per lb. over what the cheese could have been sold for near home, and from four to five cents per lb. on the butter;

besides some saving on lard, potatoes, and about seventy head of ordinary cattle. And from *thirty* to *fifty* per cent. on, from \$100 to \$350 worth of family groceries each year, in return to such of the members as sent for the same.

Besides these advantages, stimulating to industry and enterprise, and tending to increase the price of produce in the adjoining towns; others, consist in social meetings, in which inquiries are made into the best method of cultivating farms, improving the breed of cattle, horses, and sheep, manufacturing cloth, making butter and cheese; preserving the same; curing hams, meat, &c.

In 1824, the society consisted of about 25 members; in 1825, 35 or 40; and it now consists of more than 70 members; and is like to become so large as to branch into other societies.

S. H. COON, President.
C. BABCOCK, Vice Pres't.
G. R. BABCOCK, Sec'y.
C. BABCOCK, Agent.

Brookfield, Dec. 1826.

Thus, it appears, that the produce of these farmers, whom you represent to be so beggarly poor, has not only sold readily, by being sent to a market, but has brought a price considerably above what it could have brought near home, and which it is believed, is in the vicinity of some of the manufactories now established; besides which, we find, that the quantity has increased annually, contrary to your opinion, that agriculture was on the decline, for want of a home market.

A quotation from Smith, Book 3d, Chap. 4th, in which he states, that "the English Legislature had been particularly attentive to the interests of manufactures and commerce," is the occasion of a repetition

of the high eulogium you have repeatedly passed on the British government, for their disregard of his dictum, as you call it, or more properly, his sound and unanswerable reasoning against the system of monopoly and restriction. The subject treated of by Smith, in this chapter, is the improvement of the country from the commerce of the towns; and he commences the paragraph, from which you have quoted, by stating, that the natural fertility of the soil, the great extent of sea coast, in proportion to the country, and the many navigable rivers with which it abounds, fits it to be the seat of foreign commerce, of manufactures for distant sale, and of all the improvements which these can occasion; and in addition to the fitness of the country for these pursuits, he states, that the legislature had been particularly attentive to the interests of manufactures and commerce. It may be as you state, that with all these natural advantages, England would “never have had the overwhelming capital, and the unparalleled national strength,” which she now has, “if they had followed the advice of Doctor Smith.” Had England possessed a free government however, such as we possess, the people would never have suffered their rulers to depress their exertions, and individual prosperity, by monopolies and restrictions of all kinds; by repeated wars for the support of these monopolies; by an unparalleled debt; by laws of entail, by which, nearly the whole landed estate of the country is kept in the hands of a few; by an established clergy, which takes the one-tenth of the crop of the agriculturalist annually, for the good of the Church; by taxes, such as no nation under heaven was ever compelled to pay. This they never would have permitted if they had pos-

sessed the right of suffrage, and the information which this right brings with it.

On the subject of taxes, I will take the liberty of quoting from an English writer, a comparative view of those paid by the people of Great Britain and of the United States. He states the amount of taxes paid in England as follows :

Amount of taxes paid into Treasury,	124,027,583
Paid to tax gatherers for collection, &c.	3,504,938
Amount of poor taxes,	7,896,556
	<hr/>
	135,429,077
Or dollars,	341,716,308

The population of Great Britain, including army and navy, convicts in the hulks, and paupers, in 1803, he states at 10,951,338. The taxes of the United States for 1814, he states at 14,550,000, exclusive of the taxes paid to the state governments ; and the population he estimates at 7,500,000 souls. The United States therefore, imposes upon each person something less than two dollars a head ; and by adding the taxes of the state governments, and poor rates, the sum would not exceed two dollars and fifty cents ; while there is paid in Great Britain, for every soul, including soldiers, sailors, paupers, debtors, convicts, and criminals in prison, the sum of 31 dollars and 20 cents, or seven pounds six shillings sterling. The statement of taxes paid in the United States, it must be observed, was during the war, when a direct tax was levied ; the taxes now paid are solely for state purposes, and in no instance it is believed, does it amount to 50 cents per head of population. Would not the people of England gladly forego the possession of “the overwhelming capital, the irresistible means of production, secured

by the monopoly, and the unparalleled strength which they now possess," for the enjoyment of a government like ours; a freedom from restraint upon their enterprise and industry, and a reduction in their taxes and amercements, which, under present circumstances, must keep the great majority of the nation poor and miserable.

You have on several occasions, insisted that manufacturing towns were necessary for the improvement and cultivation of the country, to which they belong. That populous towns, villages, and cities, are a great advantage to the agriculture of any country, is not denied; but it does not necessarily follow, that they must be manufacturing towns, or villages, as in England; such as Birmingham, Sheffield, and other places. The state of New-York abounds with populous towns, villages, and cities, which are annually increasing in importance. They are not the offspring of cloth making, however, but of the commercial enterprise of our countrymen. It is the external and internal commerce of our country that has studded the state with cities and villages; equally beneficial to agriculture, I should presume, as though they were erected by the wealthy manufacturers, and peopled by the emigration of foreign artists. To this last mode of rearing cities and towns, however, we have no right to object, (only in a moral point of view) provided they are established and kept in operation at the expense of those who are to receive the surplus profits, and not at our expense, except so far, as we are willing to be their customers, if they will sell to us upon as good terms as others. I am of opinion, however, that both the benefit of the operatives, as well as the community, will be promoted, if our manufactures shall be kept insulated, and

not collected into towns and villages, where the means for dissipation, and the inducements to indolence, are more prevalent than in the country.

You ask, “ what must be the feelings of a man who has adventured his all in the erection of his work and in cloth, and who has made ten thousand yards, and whose outlays amounted to \$50,000, expecting to get \$55,000, when he finds he must lose the use of his works and time, and \$10,000 besides?” Truly, they cannot be very pleasant; but these are cases which are occurring daily, and in all branches of business. The purchaser of the cloth thus manufactured, if you please, lays in a large stock, expecting of course, to make a fair profit on his outlays ;he finds however, that he has bought more than there is a demand for, and the manufacturer, regardless of the situation of the trader, continues to make more cloth, and perhaps at a reduced price, in consequence of dull times, and the fall in the wages of his workmen, and the trader is compelled to sell at much less than he gave, by which, instead of making \$5,000, he loses ten. What must be his feelings ?

The shipping merchant purchases from the farmer, and manufacturer, sufficient of their products, to load his ship or ships, amounting to \$100,000, with a view of sending them to a foreign market, which he has been informed, by his correspondents, are in want of the articles; but, on their arrival, it is found, that the market has been overstocked, and many of the agricultural articles being perishable, a forced sale is made, at ruinous losses. The return instead of being sufficient to pay expenses, and leave a fair profit, is not more than half the original cost. What must be the feelings of the ship owner ? Surely, equally as unplea-

sant as that of the manufacturer of cloth, in the instance you have adduced. I might proceed to state numerous instances which have occurred within my own knowledge, that have been the means of breaking down mechanics, manufacturers, traders, and shipping merchants, particularly the latter class, and made bankrupts of them; but, what would be said to them, were they to go to Congress and insist upon further protection, by taxing the community, in order that their heavy and severe losses might be made up to them? It does appear to me, that the claim of those who have followed the mechanic, trading, or mercantile employments, and have been ruined by misfortunes, not under their control, would be as fair as that of the manufacturer.

They, the English, say you, "have for a long time been in the receipt from this country annually, of about \$8,000,000 for woollen goods. The loss of such a mass of trade must be seriously felt, even by England." And in another place, you say, we are dependent upon them for woollen, cotton, silk, cutlery, and a vast amount of other manufactures, exceeding altogether \$31,000,000. It would really appear, as though you meant it to be understood, that for the cost of these goods, nothing was given in return, but cash. The truth is, however, that England takes from us, of our domestic products, more than \$25,000,000 annually, and she might with as much propriety say to us, the loss of such a mass of trade must be severely felt, even by the United States, as that the observation should be applied to her. The exports to Great Britain and her dependencies, on an average of three years, amounted to \$31,678,494; the years taken, being

the latest reports from the Secretary of the Treasury in my possession, are 1820, 22, and 24. What would be the consequence, as it respects this trade, should the government of this country be so unwise as to prohibit foreign manufactures, it is not easy to foretel. It cannot be doubted for a moment, that the English may be supplied, from other sources, with all the articles she takes from us, and equally as cheap; and if so, why may it not follow as a matter of course, if we cease to be her customers, that she may cease to be ours?

You wonder, "that Doctor Smith does not admit the propriety of governments, saving those who have the patriotism to set up manufactures, from the overpowering competition of the already perfect establishments in older countries." And where is the wonder? If government ought to interfere at all, in assisting a new beginner in business, to cope with another who had been longer at it; may not every new beginner claim the same, even in the same country? The situation of our old established factories is a case in point. They say, as you admit, "that manufactures do not require further protection in this country;" and might with much propriety insist, if government grants what you ask, that they should, at the same time, remunerate them, for any loss they might sustain by bringing in the new, to compete with the old; because, they may say, we have served our apprenticeship to the business, and have spent much of our substance and time in perfecting the branch we are carrying on, while these new beginners, with large capitals, and no acquired knowledge, will be enabled to draw from us our workmen, who we have taught, by the offer of high wages; and thus, by lessening our ability, injure the business,

and finally break us down, in order that they may have the whole advantage of the monopoly.

“ Our government, *at the instance of the ship owners*, are now again very coolly taking their old ground of refusing to let any of our produce go to the British colonies in British ships.” Whatever, or whoever, may have been the cause of the loss of the colonial trade to the West Indies, I think I may say, without fear of contradiction, that it cannot be laid to the charge of the ship owners, although you have stated, and that without the shadow of a proof, that the measure was at their instance. That the loss of this trade is regretted by the merchants, must appear reasonable, when it is known, that the supplies to the islands, must now be made by an indirect trade, instead of a direct one, as formerly; this you must be fully sensible of, by the knowledge you possess of mercantile matters; and possessing such knowledge, it is the more surprising, that you should make the charge; but, I am sorry to say it, there appears throughout your writings, a feeling of hostility to the ship owner, who you are continually charging with hostility to manufactures, and opposition to their protection, while the shipping interest has been so amply protected by government, that their number is increased, and their riches augmented, to an incalculable amount. I have before observed, and to my mind conclusively shown, that the duties in favour of manufactures, are fully equal to any that do, or ever did exist, in favour of the shipping; and as to the riches amassed by our merchants, there is, unfortunately, but few instances to be found, where they have been enabled to save a competence for declining years.

The manufacturer of silk and woollen in France, you think, is indebted for their superiority to the wise encouragement of the government under the administration of Colbert, who advanced to the manufacturers 2,000 francs for every loom at work. This, to be sure, is rather a different mode of encouragement from that of exclusion; but, you appear to think well of it. Although it differs in manner, it is the same in effect as high duties, or prohibition of importation; and if the government are to be compelled to tax us some millions of dollars annually, for the benefit of all those who wish to set the looms at work, I should prefer the mode pursued by the French minister; because, by that means, we shall be enabled to ascertain the amount it will cost the nation annually, for the support given to one species of industry to the prejudice of all others.

You challenge us "to show the country in which manufactures have risen without the protection of government at their commencement." In like manner, we might challenge you to show the government, where the freedom of election, and the rights of man were secured, that had resorted to "absolute prohibition" of manufactured articles, in order that the citizens of that country might enjoy the monopoly of the article. In the absence of all proofs to the contrary, we will venture to say, that neither Greece nor Rome, in their best days, and while under a democratic government, resorted to the measures you recommend; and it is believed that the republics of Switzerland have no laws prohibiting foreign manufactured articles, although the greater portion of

the population of that country are artisans and manufacturers.

The exclusive privileges given to manufacturers, (and which you call protection,) by the governments of Europe, did not always emanate from a friendly feeling towards them, nor can they be ascribed to patriotic motives. The system with all its evils has been entailed upon the governments alluded to by those who preceded them; the same as negro slavery has been entailed upon this country. The manufacturing nations are in possession of a poor and degraded population that must be provided for, and the same means that produced them, must now be continued, in order that they may subsist, and the peace of the country be preserved. It is so with us; we are in possession of a large slave population, the result of former usage, by those who preceded us. The evil exists without our agency, and cannot be remedied except by time; slavery must therefore continue in some parts of our country, and the slaves be provided for, in the same manner as formerly. But were the governments of Europe now to commence manufacturing, there is some reason to doubt, whether they would resort to the same means, which they are now compelled to continue, in order that those engaged at the looms, &c. may subsist. No one will doubt, if our slave holding states were now to be first settled and cultivated, but that they would of choice be settled and cultivated by freemen, and not by slaves, even if our laws permitted slavery to exist, as it did when they were introduced.

I have already stated, in substance, that monopolies, whether in trade or manufactures, were in no instance granted, merely because they were believed to work

a general benefit to the people ; for we continually perceive a disposition, in the great mass of population in all countries, to oppose them, as partial and injurious. In order that the motive for granting these monopolies may be ascertained, we must refer to ancient times, when nearly all the governments of Europe were feudal, and when the commerce and manufactures of those governments were in their infancy. It was then that the practice commenced, and the custom was, for the sovereigns of England, France, Spain, and other kingdoms, to grant exclusive privileges to companies and individuals, and very frequently to cities. To the first the privilege of importing a particular article, or to carry on a particular branch of trade or manufacture ; and to the second, creating the port a privileged place for the entry of vessels from beyond sea. These privileges were granted by the king, as belonging to his prerogative, and were resorted to, either to raise money for a particular object, or for creating an influence in his favour, opposed to the power and influence of the Barons, who controlled nearly all the agricultural districts of the country, the population being held in a state of bondage, as vassals attached to the soil. The privileges thus granted to cities, and the inhabitants residing in them, naturally attached them to the crown ; and they were always ready, on any emergency, to assist the government with money, and to co-operate with it, in controlling the pride and independence of the Barons. They did not render these services, however, for nothing, for on any demand being made upon them and complied with, some new privilege was asked and granted ; and thus it was, that manufactures were introduced, and

the monopoly, which still exists with some modification, granted.

The objections which have arisen in my mind, against the system of "absolute prohibition, or greatly enlarged duties," which will amount to prohibition, may be comprised under the following heads :—

1st. The inequality and injustice of the measure. We claim to be free, and that no man is to be taxed without his consent. Taxes are to be equally laid upon every person, according to his ability to pay. Here, however, is a tax laid upon one part of the community, for the benefit of another part. Here is a tax, as to amount, at the mercy of the manufacturer, and of equal amount upon the poor as well as the rich ; for every man who purchases his coat of the factor, pays the same amount of tax, and if the cloth is coarse, the profits may be raised, and the tax increased accordingly, and the poor man be made to pay more than his rich neighbour.

2d. The fact, that the present duty allows a fair profit to the manufacturer. There cannot be a greater evidence of this, than what you have admitted, "that it is maintained by some of the oldest manufacturers, that no further protection is required in this country." In addition to this, we are informed through the medium of the public papers, that large sales of cloths are made, and at saving prices ; and you can scarcely enter a dry-goods store in this city, without meeting with American cloths, which are bought by the consumer, in preference to the foreign ; we may add also, that we yankees, are not often found to continue a business which we are losing money at, and we have heard of no failures, or stoppages, among the old es-

established factories, and conclude, therefore, that they are doing well, under the present duty.

3d. The paralyzing effects which large incorporated establishments have upon the industry of individuals. If the same effects are to flow from large establishments here, that have resulted in the old countries, then will the individual, who may have established himself by his industry and perseverance, be prostrated. He will not be able to stand up against the overwhelming capital employed in these large establishments, and means will be used here, as they have been elsewhere, to break down the man of small means, in order that the large establishments may possess the monopoly to themselves. In these large establishments, too, those who serve a regular apprenticeship to the business, have no chance of rising above the grade of a journeyman. They may be capable, honest, and industrious; but they have no means of setting the business up, at least, so as to compete with the great capital of the corporation. In England there are establishments, under the control of an individual, or company, which combine a great number of the mechanic arts, such as blacksmiths, whitesmiths, copper-smiths, brass-founders, silver-platers, silversmiths, and a number of other branches, which in this country are carried on successfully by individual exertion. Now, it would be a folly in any man to attempt, single-handed, to compete with an establishment such as has been alluded to, in either of the branches designated, although he may be a perfect master of the business, and in all other respects competent to carry it on. It is in this way, therefore, that large manufacturing establishments prevent individual exertion,

and keep the operators in the arts from rising in character or substance.

4th. The bad effects of these large establishments upon the moral habits of those employed in them. This has been fully shown, in several instances, when upon that part of the subject, in the body of the work; and it is presumed, therefore, that no farther illustration is necessary here.

5th. The encouragement, that a prohibition of foreign goods, will hold out to smuggling, and the demoralizing influence of that employment. It is a well known fact, that the restrictions on the importation of certain goods in England, have been the cause of the smuggling of immense quantities of those articles into the country, notwithstanding the great number of officers employed, with the assistance of cutters and vessels of war, continually on the alert to detect it. Acts of parliament have been passed, without number; but without effect; and the desperate character of those engaged in the business, places them above the law, and regardless of the consequence of its violation. Is there no danger, therefore, that the same measures here, will be attended with the like results?

6th. The nature and essence of our political compact, forbid the measure. The compact entered into by the several states, is based upon mutual concession on the part of each. We live under a government differing essentially from every other government in existence. The combination of the States is, "to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." It is in fact a government of opinion, and is composed of materials that can only be kept united by mutual concessions and forbearance. In order to promote the general wel-

fare, no act having a partial or restricted operation, must be passed. No act that shall benefit one member of the commonwealth, while it injures another. Now, the system of "absolute prohibition, or greatly enlarged duties," as proposed by the manufacturers, is viewed by some of the states, who are members of this compact, as having the effect to injure them materially, while it will benefit the citizens of another member, and give them a monopoly at the expense of the others. The question is, therefore, whether it will not be sound policy in Congress, to desist from an act, which has caused such general excitement in some of the states, and which, if persisted in, may be the cause of consequences, at least to be deprecated, if they do not prove dangerous to the union, under which, the nation has gone on and prospered?

7th. The measure is inconsistent with the freedom of the subject, and tends to abridge his liberty, by preventing him from disposing of his property to the best advantage.

8th. The evils that may arise from these large establishments, in a political point of view, are a serious objection to manufacturing towns, and villages, being encouraged in this country. We have already been told by a warm advocate for the establishment of these towns and villages, that it was only for the farmers to say the word, and Congress would be compelled to pass the law required by the manufacturers. With this threat fresh in mind, how can we doubt, should the monopoly be granted them, and the towns and villages filled with those under their control, that other measures of the same complexion will be ordered? The influence an employer has over the minds of his workmen, is considerable; but, in establishments of the

kind we are considering, it is absolute. We must bear in mind, too, that the men who will be employed in these large establishments here, are, or will be, all voters at our elections; not as it is in England, where the influence of this description of the population is of no more consequence than the slave population of this country. Let the manufacturers once get a law, that shall give them the monopoly of the manufactures; and their towns and villages well peopled, and you will not hear them calling for the help of the farmer; they will tell you they are able to help themselves, and can send to congress and to the state legislatures such men as they choose; and their influence will then be felt with a vengeance; and in addition to the monopoly, we shall see them asking for a law to prevent any citizen exercising the particular branch they are following, without their permission, as it is now in some parts of England, where they have obtained corporate rights. Instances might be cited, were it necessary, showing the operation of this influence, although on a limited scale, at the present time; and it cannot be doubted, by any who have paid attention to the subject, that it will, and must operate, wherever it can be exercised with impunity, and wherever it may be required to promote the interest of those at the head of these establishments.

I will now bring the subject to a close, by observing, that I hope I have been enabled to convince you, that the measures you have taken so much pains to support, are fraught with evil consequences to our country; and, accordingly, that they ought to be avoided by the government, and discountenanced by the people. I have endeavoured to preserve as much order in answering your reasoning and conclusions as the desultory method you have pursued would admit. If I have

omitted the notice of any material fact, or have been guilty of repetition, or used language which may in any instance be deemed too harsh, my apology is—the haste with which the work was composed, and the little spare time I was enabled to devote ; the many repetitions you have employed in conveying your ideas to your readers, and the strong language you have used when speaking of those who differed with you in opinion.

S. A.

City of New-York, Oct. 9, 1827.

NOTE A, Page 17.

ON a review of the subject, relative to the time of commencement, and that of perfecting the woollen manufactures in England, I find I have not been sufficiently accurate in my dates, or in stating the facts upon which reliance has been placed, for the conclusion arrived at.

Dr. Rees states, on the authority of Camden, that the Romans, while in possession of England, had a cloth manufacture at Winchester ; and that the first account of any distinct body of manufacturers occurs in the history of Henry First, about the year 1130. In 1189, the woollen weavers of Oxford, York, Nottingham, and several other places, are represented as paying fines to the king, for the privilege of carrying on their business. It is perhaps fair, therefore, to date the commencement of the manufacture of cloth for sale, at the last mentioned period, namely, 1189. The cloth made in England at this period, however, and for a long time after it, was white and undressed ; and in this unfinished state, it was exported to Holland, where it was dressed and dyed, and from thence shipped to Spain, Portugal, and other Kingdoms. It appears, therefore, that the art of dying cloth was unknown in England until some time during the reign of James the First ; for it is said, representations were made to that monarch, that the cloth might be dressed and dyed at home as well as abroad, and that he granted to a company, an exclusive patent, for dressing and dying of cloth, and at the same time, prohibited the exportation of the white cloth. This monopoly, however, had such an effect upon the foreign trade of the country, that in a few years after, the government was compelled to abolish the patent, and to permit the exportation of white cloth as usual. It was not until about the year 1660, that the English manufacturers first discovered the superiority of Spanish wool, and the advantages of mixing it with the best English, in their manufactures. The manufacture of this article, therefore, in all its branches of spinning, weaving, dying, and finish, does not appear to have been perfected until after the revolution of 1688, and during the reign of William and Mary. The time elapsed from the first accounts of its commencement, 1130, to the date of its perfection, 1688, will be 558 years ; but, if we assume the date of commencement from the time probable, when the article was manufactured for sale, namely 1189, it will be reduced to 499 years ; in either case, a much greater extent of time than can possibly be required by the people of the United States to bring the article to the most complete perfection.